DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 285 JC 030 134

AUTHOR	O'Quinn, Lisa Rosanne
TITLE	Factors that Influence Community College Faculty Participation in Distance Education.
PUB DATE	2002-05-00
NOTE	376p.; Doctoral dissertation presented to George Washington University for Ph.D.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC16 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Teacher Attitudes; Access to Education; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Computer Mediated Communication; *Distance Education; Internet; *Nontraditional Education; *Online Courses; Teacher Employment Benefits; Technology; Two Year Colleges; Virtual Classrooms; Web Based Instruction

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine what factors motivated community college faculty to participate in distance education. It examined the following factors from the perspective of faculty and division chairs: (1) preference toward synchronous and asynchronous course delivery; (2) rewards for distance education faculty; (3) rewards for faculty who participate in distance education training; (4) faculty rewards for developing distance education courses; (5) areas best complemented by distance education: teaching, research, or services; (6) factors that motivate faculty to participate in distance education; (7) factors that inhibit faculty from participating in distance education; and (8) attitudes toward distance education. The National Center for Educational Statistics reports that as of 1998, 34% of colleges and universities across the United States offered distance education programs. The continued growth of distance education programs is evidence that learning is no longer a linear exercise, the demand for lifelong learning will continue, and the growth of the Internet has expanded access to education. Based upon 180 responses (out of a sample of 587) from division chairs, distance faculty, and classroom faculty, the author found that faculty expressed concerns about the lack of rewards for teaching distance education, plagiarism and cheating, and how well distance education would benefit students. The author recommends establishing standards for distance education. Contains 20 tables, 109 references, and research instruments. (Author/NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 473 285

Factors that Influence Community College Faculty Participation in Distance Education

Lisa Rosanne O'Quinn

B.A., The Catholic University of America, 1986
M.S., Syracuse University, 1990

DISSERTATION

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

L. O'Quinn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC030134

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An Institutional Study of Factors that Influence Community College Faculty Participation in Distance Education

by

Lisa Rosanne O'Quinn, Ed.D.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine what factors motivate community college faculty to participate in distance education. This study will examine the following factors from the perspective of faculty and division chairs: (1) preference toward synchronous and a-synchronous course delivery; (2) different rewards for distance education faculty; (3) Rewards for faculty who participate in distance education training; (4) Faculty rewards for developing distance education courses; (5) which areas does distance education best compliment, teaching, research or services; (6) which factors motivate faculty to participate in distance education; (7) which factors inhibit faculty from participating in distance education; (8) attitudes toward distance education.

Based upon 180 responses from a sample of division chairs, distance faculty and classroom faculty the following conclusions were drawn from this study. The findings listed below are in descending order of the three highest means of responses from each group (distance only faculty [faculty who taught only distance courses]; distance faculty [faculty who taught a combination of distance and classroom courses], classroom faculty [faculty who only taught courses in a traditional classroom setting]; division chairs).

I. Preference toward Synchronous and A-Synchronous Course Delivery

Faculty who taught solely distance courses and faculty who taught a combination of distance and classroom courses preferred a-synchronous delivery and a combination of a-synchronous and synchronous. Classroom faculty overwhelmingly favored synchronous delivery and division chairs were evenly divided between preferring a-synchronous, synchronous and a combination of both.

II. Different Rewards for Distance Education Faculty

Fifty percent of the complete sample distance faculty (those who taught only distance courses and those who taught a combination of distance and classroom courses) thought that distance faculty should receive different rewards, while 37% thought that distance faculty shouldn't receive any additional compensation. Faculty who taught solely distance courses were evenly divided on this topic. Forty-three percent believed that distance faculty should be rewarded differently; while forty-three percent expressed the opinion that distance faculty shouldn't be rewarded differently from any other faculty. Classroom faculty were more pronounced in their views, with 45% responding that faculty shouldn't be rewarded different for teaching via distance education, 33% responding that distance faculty should receive different rewards and 6% were undecided.

III. Rewards for faculty who participate in distance education training

All distance faculty (those who taught only distance courses and those who taught a combination of distance and classroom courses) were divided in their responses. Twenty-nine percent thought distance faculty should receive release time; Twelve percent thought distance faculty should receive a stipend; Eighteen percent believed that distance faculty should not receive a stipend or release time or a stipend; Four percent felt that distance faculty should receive either a stipend or release time and four percent thought that distance faculty should receive a stipend and release time. Distance only faculty (faculty who only taught distance courses) demonstrated a higher rate of agreement in their responses with 29% believing that distance faculty should receive release time; Twenty-nine percent felt that distance faculty should receive either a stipend or release time and 14% thought that distance faculty should receive a release time and stipend. Classroom faculty opinions were divided amongst release time (27%); faculty receiving neither a stipend or release time (22%); faculty receiving both stipend and release time (15%). The vast majority of division chairs (39%) thought that distance faculty should receive neither stipends or release time, while only 15% thought faculty should receive either stipend or release time, and another 15% thought distance should receive stipend and release time.

IV. Faculty rewards for developing distance education courses

The vast majority of distance faculty who taught a combination of classroom courses and distance courses (65%) and distance faculty who taught solely distance courses (57%) interpreted distance education as fitting the category of teaching. A small percentage of distance faculty who taught distance and classroom courses (20%) categorized distance education as teaching and service. Faculty who taught only distance courses (29%) placed distance education in the category of research, teaching and service. Classroom faculty (66%) and division chairs (62%) thought that distance education best fit the category of teaching.

VI. Factors which motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education

Factors which most strongly motivated faculty who are currently teaching only distance courses to teach courses via distance education were: (1) flexible working conditions; (2) intellectual challenge of distance education; (3) ability to reach new audiences who can't attend campus based classes. Faculty who were teaching a combination of distance and classroom courses were most motivated by the following factors: (1) more flexible working conditions; (2) personal motivation to use technology; (3) opportunity to develop new ideas for courses. The factors that more strongly influenced classroom faculty's faculty to consider participation in distance education included: (1) increase in salary; (2) ability to reach new audiences who can't attend campus-based classes; (3) more flexible working conditions. Division chairs were most motivated to teach via distance education by the following factors: (1) receiving a stipend for distance education participation; (2) Increase in salary; (3) personal motivation to use technology.

VII. Factors which Inhibit Faculty from Participating in Distance Education

The following factors deterred faculty who are currently teaching only distance courses to teach courses via distance education from participating in distance education: (1) Lack of monetary support (i.e. stipend); (2) concern about faculty workload; (3) lack of salary increase. Faculty who taught a combination of distance and classroom courses were most deterred from participating in distance education by the following factors: (1) concern about faculty workload; (2) lack of release time; (3) lack of salary increase. Classroom faculty responded that the following factors most deterred them from participating in distance education: (1) concern about quality of courses; (2) concern about faculty workload; (3) lack of release time. Division chairs responses mirrored those of distance faculty: (1) concern about faculty workload; (2) lack of release time; (3) lack of monetary support (i.e., stipend).

VIII. Attitudes toward Distance Education

As expected, both groups of distance faculty responded very positively toward distance education, with 86% expressing positive attitudes. Distance faculty who only taught distance courses had a slightly higher negative rating of distance education (14%) compared with the entire population of distance faculty who responded negatively (4%).

Classroom faculty were very divided in their views with 33% who had positive views; 20% who held negative views and 42% who were neutral toward distance education. The vast majority of division chairs held positive views (69%) and a small percentage (23%) were neutral toward distance education.

TABLE OF TABLES

1. Low and High Means of Distance Faculty Responses to the Question of Which Factors Motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education and to Continue to Participate in Distance Education 133

2. Low and High Means of Classroom Faculty Responses to the Question of Which Factors Would Motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education 134

3. Low and High Means of Division Chairs Responses to the Question of Which Factors Would Motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education 135

4. Motivating Factors about which Classroom and Distance Faculty and Division Chairs disagreed on the degree that they would motivate them to participate in Distance Education 138

5. Motivating Factors about which Classroom and Distance Faculty disagreed on the degree that they would motivate them to participate in Distance Education. 139

6. Inhibiting Factors which Distance Faculty Disagreed had any Influence on Their Willingness to Participate in Distance Education 142

7. Inhibiting Factors which Classroom Faculty Would or Would not Inhibit their Decision to Participate in Distance Education. 143

8. A Comparison of Classroom and Distance Faculty's Responses as to Which Inhibitors would Influence their Decision to Participate in Distance Education 143

9. A List of Inhibitors which Division Chairs Either Agreed or Disagreed would Influence their Decision to Participate in Distance Education 144

10. A comparison of Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses as to which Inhibitors would influence their decision to Participate in Distance Education 145

11. Distance faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Preferred Mode of Course Delivery 187

12. Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "Should Faculty be Rewarded Differently for their Participation in Distance Education 194

13. Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "How Faculty Should be Rewarded for their Participation in Distance Education Training 194

14. Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "How Faculty Should be Rewarded for Developing Distance Education Courses 195

15. Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question, "How does Distance Education best fit the Categories of Teaching, Research or Service?" 200

16-A. The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education." 203

16-B. The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education." 206

16-C. The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education." 207

16-D. The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education." 209

17-A. The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education." 219

17-B. The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education." 220

17-C. The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education." 222

17-D. The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education." 223

18. The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty, Distance Faculty and Division Chairs to the Question "What is your Attitude Toward Distance Education?" 224

19. The Number of Faculty who Teach Distance Courses by Division and Campus and the Student Enrollment Headcount at Each Campus. 225

20. The Number of Faculty who Design Distance Courses by Division and Campus 226

21. The Number of distance courses offered by Division at each of the Five Campuses 226

22. The Total Number of Distance Courses offered at the Community College by Division 226

TABLE OF APPENDICES

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A:
Cover letter, executive summary of dissertation proposal and deans survey for pilot study

APPENDIX B:
Letter to director of institutional research at community college where primary data was collected.

APPENDIX C:
Letter and survey to division chair at community college where primary data was collected.

APPENDIX D:
Letter and survey to faculty at community college where primary data was collected.

APPENDIX E:
Text of email that was sent to faculty reminding them to complete their survey.

APPENDIX F:
List of interview questions that were posed to the dean and associate dean of distance learning.

APPENDIX G:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 11
Distance faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Preferred Mode of Course

APPENDIX H:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 12
Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "Should Faculty be Rewarded Differently for their Participation in Distance Education

APPENDIX I:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 13
Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "How Faculty Should be Rewarded for their Participation in Distance Education Training"

APPENDIX J:

Statistics that were calculated for Table 14
Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "How Faculty Should be Rewarded for Developing Distance Education Courses"

APPENDIX K:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 15
Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question, "How does Distance Education best fit the Categories of Teaching, Research or Service?"

APPENDIX L:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 16-A:
The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

APPENDIX M:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 16-B:
The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

APPENDIX N:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 16-C:
The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

APPENDIX O:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 16-D
The Means of the Responses from Division Chairs to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

APPENDIX P:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 17-A:
The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

APPENDIX Q:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 17-B:
The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

APPENDIX R:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 17-C:
The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

APPENDIX S:

Statistics that were calculated for Table 17-D:
The Means of the Responses from Division Chairs to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

APPENDIX T:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 18:
The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty, Distance Faculty and Division Chairs to the Question "What is your Attitude Toward Distance Education?"

APPENDIX U:
Cronbach Alpha Results for Motivating and Inhibiting Factors for the Entire Sample

APPENDIX G:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 11
Distance faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Preferred Mode of Course

APPENDIX H:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 12
Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "Should Faculty be Rewarded Differently for their Participation in Distance Education

APPENDIX I:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 13
Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "How Faculty Should be Rewarded for their Participation in Distance Education Training"

APPENDIX J:

Statistics that were calculated for Table 14
Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "How Faculty Should be Rewarded for Developing Distance Education Courses"

APPENDIX K:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 15
Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question,
"How does Distance Education best fit the Categories of Teaching, Research or Service?"

APPENDIX L:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 16-A:
The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

APPENDIX M:

Statistics that were calculated for Table 16-B:

The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

APPENDIX N:

Statistics that were calculated for Table 16-C:

The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

APPENDIX O:

Statistics that were calculated for Table 16-D
The Means of the Responses from Division Chairs to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

APPENDIX P:

Statistics that were calculated for Table 17-A: The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

APPENDIX Q:

Statistics that were calculated for Table 17-B: The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

APPENDIX R:

Statistics that were calculated for Table 17-C: The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

APPENDIX S:

Statistics that were calculated for Table 17-D: The Means of the Responses from Division Chairs to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

APPENDIX T:
Statistics that were calculated for Table 18:
The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty, Distance Faculty and Division Chairs to the Question "What is your Attitude Toward Distance Education?"

APPENDIX U:

Cronbach Alpha Calculations for the Validity and Reliability of Inhibiting and Motivating Factors For the Entire Sample

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband Dr. Andrew Goldstein. His constant love, unwavering faith in my abilities, encouragement, patience, willingness to make sacrifices and support in many forms have enabled me to complete my dissertation.

0: 31

LISA ROSANNE O'QUINN COPYRIGHT 2002

CHAPTER I

Introduction:

The National Center for Educational Statistics reports that as of 1998, 34% of colleges and universities across the United States offered distance education programs. Twenty percent of these institutions planned to offer courses via distance education between 1999 and 2001 and 47% of the institutions reported that they had no intention of offering distance education courses. (http://nces.ed.gov/quicktables). These data also represent a 5% decrease from 25% in 1995 to 20% in 1998 in institutions that planned to offer distance education courses over the next three years In addition, the data also reflects a 5% increase from 42% in 1995 to 47% in 1998 in the percentage of institutions who said that they have no intention of offering distance education courses (http://nces.ed.gov/pubs99/condition99/indicator-31.html).

The United States Department of Education also projected in 1995 that public institutions were more likely to offer distance education courses than private institutions, and more students who were attending community colleges were enrolled in distance education courses in 1995 than in other types of institutions (http://nces.ed.gov/pubs99/condition99/indicator-31.html).

The continuous growth of distance education programs is evidence that (1) learning is no longer a linear exercise and the demand for lifelong learning will continue (2) the growth of the internet has expanded the access of education to persons who could not attend classes on campus due to conflicts in work and life responsibilities, (3) the growth of technology has pervaded every area of life, (4) the slowing of economic growth in the United States may encourage adult learners to return to college to learn new skills, explore a second career or complete another degree that may enable them to be more competitive in the workplace (Drucker, 2000, Ford, 1987).

The ever increasing number of distance education programs is evidence that higher education institutions are striving to meet the education and training needs of individual adult students and industries that are seeking training for their employees. However, the decrease in the percentage of institutions that said they had planned to offer distance education programs and the increase in the percentage of colleges that said they had no intentions of offering distance education programs may stem from what Tierney (1991) describes as institutions that are sensitive to their identity, mission and the constituents they serve. Some institutions do not perceive distance education as contributing to their mission and therefore do not offer distance education programs. Despite the fact that distance education does not suit all institutional missions, Tierney (1991) cautions institutions whose missions are so narrowly focused as he believes that they cannot readily react to the changes in their environment and therefore may not be able to seize opportunities for institutional growth. Thus, by restricting their goals they may avoid the integration of technology into their mission, but they may also be left stagnant with clear and narrow goals which can breed division rather than consensus.

Institutions of higher education have not always sought ways in which they could have integrated innovative ideas into their own mission and as a result have been content to measure their progress by the effectiveness and efficiency of their productivity rather than focus on larger concerns of democracy and social justice (Tierney, 1991; Lincoln, 1991). Such a narrow focus can be demonstrated by the colleges founded in the 18th to mid 19th centuries, which were primarily for young men from wealthy families. Higher education only began to respond to society with a more democratic voice when Congress passed the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. The creation of land grant institutions, extension sites, and evening colleges signaled a paradigm shift toward higher education becoming more responsive to larger social contexts and an adult population who sought educational opportunities. Colleges and universities were offering programs at times and locations that were convenient to adult learners, rather than expecting them to conform their lives to a university schedule (Knowles, 1977; Portman, 1978; Brubacher & Rudy, 1976).

This new paradigm shift of allowing adult learners to access education at times and places that were convenient for them is now normative for most colleges and universities who market their programs to adult learners. Universities who are most successful at delivering these learner-centered programs also have faculty who are motivated and willing to learn new pedagogies, and integrate adult learning techniques and technologies into the curricula.

Faculty who teach adult learners must not only be willing to learn new modes of delivery (i.e., distance education), they must also be capable of changing their philosophy towards learning. (Grasinger, 1999; Gehlauf, Shatz and Frye, 1991). Their delivery methods must reflect those of a facilitator who empowers students to become active self-directed learners and enables them to learn by interacting with the course content and their fellow classmates (Moore and Kearsley, 1996).

In addition to faculty embracing a change in their philosophy toward learning, higher education needs to create a reward structure that values and recognizes faculty who are willing to make these changes in their teaching and learning.

Higher education also needs to provide continued support to faculty who engage in distance education so that they may be able to not only continue, but expand their research and teaching in this field. At the time this dissertation was written, the literature failed to reach a consensus about in which category distance education should placed (research, teaching or service), how distance education will impact the role of the faculty member and how both of these factors will affect faculty's motivation to teach distance education (Metzer, 1998 and Wolcott, 1997). Betts (1998) and Wolcott (1997 & 1999) have shown that faculty at research institutions perceive distance education as conflicting with the university's expectation that they research and publish. Faculty interviewed in Betts' (1998) and Wolcott's (1997 & 1999) studies also demonstrated a reluctance to collaborate with other colleagues in distance education courses, as they feared wide dissemination of their work would violate their intellectual property rights, a concern that has also been voiced by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (http://www.aaup.org/spcdistn). In addition to the possible violation of intellectual property, these collaborative ventures might also create an expectation that faculty will commit to fundamental changes in their philosophy toward teaching and learning. Faculty involved in collaborative ventures often work within a "systems approach" to distance education which expects them to work with course designers, researchers and evaluators to produce and deliver courses (Moore & Kearsley, 1996).

However, faculty who are willing to work collaboratively with their colleagues to design and/or deliver distance education courses need to receive support from their institutions of higher learning in terms of faculty training, mentoring with colleagues and administrative, clerical and technical assistance (Dillon and Walsh, 1992). The success of faculty who choose to embrace distance education is largely contingent upon the degree of support that institutions are willing to give them (Beaudoin, 1990). Astin (1985) notes "… true excellence lies in the institution's ability to … affect faculty favorably, to enhance their intellectual and scholarly development, and to make a positive difference in their lives…. the talent development conception of excellence focuses on changes …[that] occur along such dimensions as teaching ability, mentoring ability, scholarly ability and productivity."

Given this uncertain landscape of how distance education is valued and rewarded by the academy, this study seeks to determine what factors motivate and deter faculty at the community college in their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education.

Problem Statement:

Distance education continues to be a means of increasing the access of higher education to a wider audience. Faculty are the key resource that make the delivery of distance education possible. However, if faculty are to provide distance courses they must learn a new set of teaching skills which requires more time and effort (Inman, Kerwin and Mayes, 1999; Gillespie, 1998).

Despite faculty's central role in developing and providing distance education courses, a survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education noted that faculty development in teaching distance education is not considered by universities to be crucial in the continued delivery of distance education course as are other resources. The Department of Education noted in its 1995 survey that of the institutions which offered 25,730 distance education courses, three quarters of these institutions relied upon faculty to develop these courses (http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs98/distance/98062-1.html) and only a quarter of these universities required faculty to have training in distance education. About 13% of these institutions surveyed required training in curriculum development, and 17% required training in teaching methods for distance education courses. When universities in this survey were asked to state their program goals for the next three years, 18% responded that they either wanted to begin offering distance courses or increase the number of distance education course they were teaching. These institutions also sought to increase distance education enrollments, and to upgrade the technology they were currently using (http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs98/distance/98062-1.html).

Absent in the program goals of the colleges and universities included in this study were training for faculty who would teach these courses – a factor that would directly relate to increased course offerings and enrollments. Given the results of the U.S. Department of Education's survey, this study seeks to determine what factors influence community college faculty's decision to participate in distance education.

The Statement of Purpose:

The purpose of this study is to determine what factors influence community college faculty in their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education. This study will examine the impact the following factors have upon community college faculty's motivation to participate in distance education: (1) demographic profile of classroom faculty, distance faculty and division chairs; (2) the extent to which classroom faculty, distance faculty and division chairs use technology to support their courses and to communicate with faculty, students and staff; (3) the length and degree of distance faculty's participation in distance education; (4) teaching via distance education, co-teaching via distance education and designing distance courses; (5) reasons cited by faculty for no longer teaching distance education or not wanting to teach distance education in the future; (6) the absence of the research role; (7) the types of distance education delivery systems that are currently used; (8) percentage of faculty that did and did not receive distance education training; (9) years in which faculty received training; (10) where faculty received training; (11) delivery systems faculty were trained to use; (12) release time for distance education training ; (13) level of interest in training of those faculty who never received training; (14) Areas in which faculty would like to receive training; (15) distance faculty's rating of technical and administrative support and technical and pedagogical training; (16) all faculty and division chairs' preferred delivery mode – synchronous or a-synchronous; (17) faculty responsibility in designing and delivering distance courses; (18) distance faculty's, classroom faculty's and division chairs' attitudes toward different rewards for faculty who participate in distance education; (19) faculty and division chairs' attitudes toward rewards for faculty who participate in distance education training; (20) faculty and division chairs' attitudes toward rewards for faculty who develop distance education courses; (21) the relationship between distance education and the mission of the community college; (22) factors that would motivate distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs to participate in distance education; (23) the change in faculty role from a knowledge provider to a facilitator; (24) factors that would inhibit distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs from participating in distance education; (25) distance faculty's, classroom faculty's and division chairs' attitudes toward distance education; (26) the number of distance faculty by campus and division who teach via distance education; (27) the number of faculty by campus and division who design courses that will be delivered via distance education; (28) the number of distance education courses offered by division at each of the five campuses within the community college.

Through interviews with the dean and associate dean of distance education this study also sought to determine: (1) the administrative structure and responsibilities of the department of distance education; (2) factors which the dean and associate dean perceive as motivating faculty to participate in distance education; (3) the budget for the department of distance education and how funds are administered; (4) the characteristics which the dean and associate dean of distance learning perceive as being common in the faculty who participate in distance education; (5) The dean and associate dean of distance education address faculty criticisms of distance education; (6) the dean and associate dean's perceptions of faculty and division chairs' perceptions of distance education distance education training that is available for faculty at the community college; (7) Distance training that is available for faculty at the community college; (8) intellectual property rights policies currently in place at the community college; (9) the dean and associate dean's perception of faculty rewards for participation in distance education; (10) the effect the community college mission has had upon the distance education program; (11) academic standards for classroom and distance courses; (12) current challenges and expectations of distance education.

Methodology:

The selected sample for the primary data collection included 72 full-time faculty who taught classroom courses and distance education courses, 500 full-time faculty who taught only classroom-based courses and 15 division chairs at a community college located in a metropolitan area along the East Coast of the United States. All those included in this selected sample were purposefully selected. The survey the researcher utilized was based upon Betts (1998), and it was test piloted at four community colleges located on the East coast of the United States. The instrument was revised to include questions appropriate to faculty at a community college. The survey was designed to identify factors that motivate and inhibit community college faculty's decision of whether or not to participate in distance education. Data obtained from these surveys was coded and entered into a statistical software program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Data analysis included the use of means, frequencies, percentages, standard deviations, and cronbach alphas.

Research Questions:

A. Demographic Profile of Classroom Faculty, Distance Faculty and Division Chairs

1. In what academic divisions do distance faculty teach?

2. What is the average age of distance faculty?

3. Do most distance faculty hold tenured positions, accruing tenured position or contract positions?

4.How many years have classroom and distance faculty taught at the community college?

5. What is the gender of most distance faculty?

6. How does the course load of distance faculty who are teaching both distance and classroom courses differ from classroom faculty who only teach traditional classroom courses?

B. The Extent to which Classroom Faculty, Distance Faculty and Division Chairs use Technology to support their Courses and to Communicate with Faculty, Students and Staff.

1. What technologies do classroom and distance faculty and division chairs use to support distance education courses?

2.What technologies do classroom and distance faculty and division chairs use to communicate with students, faculty and staff?

3. Which group (classroom faculty, distance faculty or division chairs) has the highest usage rate of technology?

4. Which type of technology does each group use the most frequently?

C. The Length and Degree of Distance Faculty's Participation in Distance Education

1. What the average number of years which distance faculty and division chairs have been engaged in distance education?

D. Teaching via Distance Education, Co-Teaching via Distance Education and Designing Distance Courses

1. Have distance faculty, classroom faculty or division chairs been asked to teach a distance course?

2. Did they teach the distance course?

3. Have distance faculty, classroom faculty or division chairs been asked to co-teach a distance course?

4.Did they co-teach the distance course?

5. Have distance faculty, classroom faculty or division chairs been asked to design a distance course?

6. Did they design the distance course?

7. Would those faculty and division chairs who have not taught a distance course be interested in teaching a distance course in the future?

8. Would those faculty and division chairs who have not co-taught a distance course be interested in co-teaching a distance course in the future?

9. Would those faculty and division chairs who have not designed a distance course be interested in designing a distance course in the future?

E. Reasons Cited by Faculty for No Longer Teaching Distance Education or Not Wanting to Teach Distance Education in the Future

1. What factors inhibit faculty from wanting to participate in distance education?

2. Do faculty cite any reasons for not participating that are included on the researcher's list of inhibiting factors?

F. The impact that the Absence of the Research Role at the Community College has had upon Faculty's Decision of Whether or Not to Participate in Distance Education

1. Given that the community college does not expect their faculty to conduct research, does the absence of this role provide them with more time in which they choose to participate in distance education?

G. The Types of Delivery Systems that Distance Faculty are Currently Using

1. What delivery systems are currently being by distance faculty?

H. Percentage of Faculty that did and did not receive Distance Education Training

1. What percentage of distance faculty did receive training?

2. What percentage of distance faculty did not receive training?

4. If faculty did not receive formal training, how did they learn how to deliver distance courses?

4. What percentage of distance faculty would be interested in receiving distance training in the future?

5. What conditions, if any did distance faculty cite for them to attend training?

6. What percentage of classroom faculty received distance education training?

I. Years in Which Faculty Received Training

1. How recently have distance faculty received their training?

J. Where did Distance Faculty Receive their training?

1. Did the majority of distance faculty receive their training at corporations, proprietary schools or colleges and universities?

K. Delivery Systems that Faculty were Trained to Use

1. What delivery systems faculty were trained to use?

2. How do the delivery systems they were trained to use correspond to the delivery systems they are currently using?

L. Release Time for Distance Education Training

1. Of the faculty who received distance education training, did they receive release time for participating in this training?

M. Level of Interest in Training of Those Faculty who never received Training

1. What interest do classroom and distance faculty and division chairs who never received training have in receiving distance training?

2. What percentage of faculty and division chairs were not interested in seeking distance education training?

3. What reasons did classroom faculty cite for not wanting to participate in distance education training?

N. Areas in which Faculty would like to Receive Training

1. In which areas would classroom faculty be interested in receiving training?

2. In which areas would distance faculty be interested in receiving training?

3. In which areas would distance faculty be interested in receiving training?

O. Distance Faculty's Rating of Technical and Administrative Support and Technical and Pedagogical Training

1. On a four point scale (ranging from very good to inadequate) how do distance faculty rate the technical and administrative support and the technical and pedagogical training that is available to them?

P. All Faculty and Division Chairs' Preferred Mode of Delivery – Synchronous and A-synchronous

1.Do faculty and division chairs prefer synchronous, a-synchronous delivery or a combination of both?

2. Is there a difference amongst distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs as to which delivery mode they prefer?

3. How did the advantages and disadvantages of synchronous and a-synchronous delivery modes influence their preference?

Q. Faculty Responsibility in Design and Delivery of Distance Courses

1. Do distance faculty at the community college engage in a "systems approach" in their delivery of distance courses, a "combined approach" of consulting with other faculty or course designers or are they responsible for the design and delivery of their own courses?

(A systems approach is defined as a team of experts (content experts, instructional designers, graphic designers, researchers and evaluators) who work together to provide a control mechanism that ensures that all component processes are well integrated and interact with each other" (Moore and Kearsley, 1996; Boston, 1992).

2. Would classroom faculty prefer to engage in a "systems approach" in their delivery of distance courses, engage in a "combined approach" of consulting with other faculty or course designers or are they responsible for the design and delivery of their own courses?

R. Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Attitudes Toward Different Rewards for Faculty who Participate in Distance Education

1. Do distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs believe that faculty should be rewarded differently for their participation in distance education than they would be for participation in teaching traditional classroom courses?

S. Faculty and Division Chairs' Attitudes toward Rewards for Faculty who participate in Distance Education Training.

1. Do distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs think that distance faculty should receive release time, stipend, neither stipend or release time, either a stipend and release time or both a stipend and release time for their participation in distance education training?

T. Faculty and Division Chairs' Attitudes toward Rewards for Faculty who Develop Distance Education Courses

1. Do distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs think that distance faculty should receive release time, stipend, neither stipend or release time, either a stipend or

release time or both a stipend and release time for their participation in developing distance education courses?

U. The Relationship between Distance Education and the Mission of the Community College

1. How do distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs perceive distance education would best compliment the mission of the community college, under the categories of teaching, research, service, teaching, research and service, teaching and service, or teaching and research?

V. Factors that would Motivate Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs to Participate in Distance Education

1. To what extent would the following factors motivate distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs to participate in distance education?

Personal motivation to use technology

Reduced teaching load

Support from division chair

More flexible working conditions

Increase in salary

Strengthened job security

Receiving a stipend for distance education participation

College expectation that faculty participate

Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses

Visibility for jobs at other colleges and universities

Grants for materials and expenses

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Support from departmental colleagues

Intellectual challenge of distance education

Technical, administrative and clerical support

Extent to which distance education would provide opportunities for career exploration and expansion

Credit toward promotion and tenure

Release time

Provision of distance training by the college

Merit pay

Royalties on copyrighted materials

Protection of intellectual property rights

Opportunity to diversity program offerings

Recognition and rewards from the college

Ability to reach new audiences who can't attend campus based courses

Opportunity to improve classroom teaching through distance education participation

Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider to a facilitator

Opportunity to work with course designers, distance education instructors and technologists to develop and deliver distance courses

Creating support systems to retain distance faculty

Opportunity to teach a distance course in a "synchronous environment"

Opportunity to teach a distance course in an "a-synchronous environment"

W. The Impact that the Faculty Role Changing from a Knowledge Provider to a Facilitator has had upon Faculty and Division Chairs' Decision to Participate in Distance Education

1. How has the change in the role of knowledge provider to facilitator influenced distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs in their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education?

X. Factors that would Inhibit Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs from Participating in Distance Education

1. To what extent would the following factors inhibit distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs from participating in distance education?

Concern about faculty workload

Lack of distance training provided by the college

Lack of support from departmental colleagues

Lack of release time

Lack of professional prestige

Lack of technological background

Lack of support from division chair

Lack of grants or materials for expenses

Concern about the quality of courses

Lack of administrative, technical or clerical support

Lack of merit pay

Lack of royalties on copyrighted materials

Lack of monetary support (i.e. stipend)

Concern about quality of students

Lack of recognition or rewards

Lack of salary increase

Lack of credit toward promotion and tenure

A sense of loss of control over the teaching and learning process

A dislike for the collaborative nature of distance program design and delivery

Change in faculty role from a knowledge provider to a facilitator

Teaching a distance course in a "synchronous environment"

Teaching a distance course in an "a-synchronous environment"

Y. Distance faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Attitudes toward Distance Education

1. How do distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs perceive distance education, positively, negatively or neutrally?

Z. The Number of Distance Faculty by Campus and Division who Teach via Distance Education

1. How many faculty teach via distance education in each division and campus?

AA. The Number of Faculty by Campus and Division who Design Courses that will be Delivered via Distance Education

1. How many faculty in each division and campus design distance courses?

BB. The Number of Distance Education Courses offered by Division at Each of the Five Campuses within the Community College.

1. How many distance courses are offered in each division and on each campus?

Research Questions for Interviews Conducted with the Dean and Associate Dean of the Department of Distance Education

A. The Administrative Structure of the Department of Distance Education

1. What is the administrative structure of the Department of Distance Education?

2. What is the role of the Office in Distance Learning in assisting students and faculty?

B. Factors which the Dean and Associate Dean perceive as Motivating Faculty to Participate in Distance Education

1. What factors do the dean and associate dean perceive as motivating faculty to participate in distance education?

2. How do faculty's teaching styles influence their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education?

D. The Characteristics which the Dean and Associate Dean of Distance Education perceive as being common in the faculty who participate in distance education

1. Are faculty who are early, mid-way or late in their careers attracted to distance education?

2. Are these faculty looking for more of a challenge in their teaching environments?

E. The Dean and Associate Dean of Distance Education address Faculty Criticisms of Distance Education

1. What are some of the most criticisms made toward distance education by faculty who have never taught distance courses?

2. How do the dean and associate dean address these criticisms?

3. How do the dean and associate dean address classroom faculty's fears that distance courses are drawing students away from campus courses?

F. The Dean and Associate Dean's Perceptions of faculty and division chairs' Attitudes of Distance Education

1. What kind of relationship has the associate dean developed with the division chairs?

2. How do you work with the chairs to determine how many distance courses faculty will teach?

F. Distance Education Training and Faculty Responsibility for the Design and Delivery of their Courses

1. How does the College presently design and deliver its distance courses? Is there a team of course designers and technologists who assist faculty in this process, or are faculty solely responsible for the design and the delivery of their own courses?

2. What training opportunities are currently available for faculty who want to teach via distance education?

3. Are distance training sessions designed in convenient formats?

4. What opportunities are available for experienced faculty to mentor faculty who are just beginning to teach distance courses?

G. Intellectual Property Rights Currently in Place at the Community College

1. What is the current intellectual property rights policy in place at the community college?

2. How do faculty and the college benefit from the current policy?

3. Under the current policy who owns the distance courses which are being delivered?

4. Does the current policy inhibit faculty from wanting to participate in distance education?

H. The Dean and Associate Dean's Response to Rewards for Distance Faculty

1. How do the dean and associate dean of distance education believe that distance faculty should be rewarded?

2. Do the dean and associate dean believe that faculty should be rewarded for teaching via distance education? Why? Why not?

3. Do the dean and associate dean believe that faculty should be rewarded for participating in distance education training? Why? Why not?

4. How do they address concerns about faculty workload in distance education?

5. How do they attract faculty to teach via distance education?

I. The Effect the Community College has had upon Distance Education

1. How do the dean and associate dean of distance education perceive the mission of distance education and that of the community college complimenting each other or conflicting with each other?

2. Do they perceive distance education as being well suited for traditional age students? Why? Why not?

3. How does the rolling admissions policy (allowing a student to begin a class at any point in the semester) impact distance education programs?

4. How does the policy of open enrollment (allowing any student with a high school diploma to enroll at the community college)?

J. Academic Standards for Classroom and Distance Courses

1. What are the current academic standards for distance and classroom courses? Who establishes these standards?

2. Are the same academic standards applied to distance and classroom courses?

I. Current Challenges and Expectations of Distance Education at this Community College

1. What is the biggest challenge the dean and associate dean see facing the department of distance education in the immediate future?

2. How will the dean and associate dean face this challenge?

3. How do you see the department of distance education expanding in the future?

4. How do the dean and associate dean see the process by which courses are delivered and designed changing in the future?

Need for the Study:

As adult learners continue to access higher education as a means of coping with life and career changes, colleges and universities will continue to respond to learners needs' through distance education. Faculty are the primary providers of distance courses and often times in a distance environment will serve as students first and only interaction with the university. The delivery of these courses is dependent upon faculty who are willing to engage in distance education and are trained to facilitate learning in this setting. Therefore, success of distance education depends upon higher education's ability to identify factors that influence faculty's decision to participate in this type of education and institutions' willingness to allocate resources so that these faculty may be compensated fairly for their efforts. Once these factors and resources are identified and secured, colleges and universities can more easily attract and retain faculty to teach in distance education environments.

However, some colleges and universities often do not provide distance education training to faculty, nor do they compensate them for development of distance courses.

Ross and King (1999) found that supporters of distance education could reduce the difficulties that faculty encounter by providing support and opportunities for more exposure to distance education. The California State Planning Commission for Educational Technology (1992) recommended that technology be implemented at colleges and universities under the guise of a strategic plan which included professional development and technological and instructional resources.

Conceptual Framework:

The constructs which comprise the focus of this study include: (1) institutional support faculty receive toward the distance learning courses they teach; (2) rewards/compensation toward promotion that faculty receive for distance education courses they teach and/or design; (3) factors that motivate faculty to teach distance education courses; (4) factors that inhibit faculty from teaching distance education courses; (5) how rewards might impact faculty's decision of whether or not to teach distance education courses; (6) how intellectual property rights are protected and preserved at the community college where the primary data collection was conducted, and if this has any impact upon faculty's decision of whether or not to teach via distance education, and (7) how faculty participation or lack thereof has been affected by the paradigm shift of learner-centered education and collaborative efforts in the development and delivery of distance education courses.

This study is presented from the perspective of how technology has changed the world economy from an industrial base to a "knowledge worker society", and has transformed learning from a linear involvement to a fluid activity in which people will continually engage throughout their lives (Green, 1999; Drucker 2000; Marshall &

Tucker, 1992). People are now expected to possess a greater depth and breadth of knowledge, and higher education is called to respond to these demands not only through relevant program content, but also through the fluid delivery system of distance education (Drucker, 2000& El-Khawas, 1999).

As higher education continues to respond to adult students' need for accessing education and training, colleges and universities have not consistently provided faculty with institutional support, training in distance education, rewards and/or compensation that they have needed in order to provide distance education courses (AAUP, 2000, http://www.aaup.org/spcdistn.htm). Within Carnegie level I research institutions there is a demand from learners to provide distance education, but there is a conflict between the faculty reward system (which favors work in scholarly publications and research) and the societal expectation that faculty will continue to deliver distance education programs. Some faculty at research institutions perceive universities pursuing distance education as a means for the institution to make a profit from distance learning enrollments at the cost of resources that could be allocated toward faculty research (The Primary Research Group, Inc., 2000; Stallings, 1997).

To the contrary of the mission of research institutions, the community college's focus on teaching and service does not present faculty with this same conflict amongst research, teaching and service. Therefore, given the difference in reward structures of research universities and community colleges, this study seeks to determine if the absence of a research role has an impact upon faculty's motivation to teach courses via distance education.

Despite the differences in mission between community colleges and research institutions, two concerns faculty at both types of institutions share are protection of intellectual property rights and a shift from faculty-centered teaching to student-centered learning. Some faculty prefer a "teacher-centered" course delivery where they have more control over the learning and teaching process to a "learner- centered" course delivery where the instructor serves as a facilitator. Grossman (1989) cites faculty's disinterest in distance education as stemming from the lack of faculty involvement and oversight in every component of its development.

Some faculty not only resist distance education due to the change in their faculty role, they also fear that their intellectual property rights will be violated through the public access of their notes, discussions or lectures from the world wide web or printed materials. Faculty concern with intellectual property goes beyond use of material without their consent, to address what type of copyright ownership they have over their materials (http://www.aaup.org/DistncEd.htm). The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has outlined three different types of copyright that, depending upon the circumstances, may or may not apply to faculty:

> (1) "Works Made for Hire"
>
> "Works created as a specific requirement of employment or as an assigned institutional duty that may, for example, be included in a written job description or an employment agreement… Examples may include reports prepared by a dean or department chair … or promotional materials designed by the director of admissions." (http://www.aaup. org/stcopy rt.htm).

(2) "Contractual Transfers"

"In situations in which the copyright ownership is held by the faculty (or staff) member it is possible for the individual to transfer the entire copyright or a more limited license, to the institution or third party . . . the college or university may reasonably request that the faculty member -- when entering into an agreement granting the copyright or publishing rights to a third party—make efforts to reserve to the institution the right to use the work in its internally administered programs of teaching, research and public service on a perpetual , royalty-free, nonexclusive basis. (http://www.aaup.org/stcopyrt.htm).

(3) "Joint Works":

"Under certain circumstances, two or more persons may share copyright ownership of a work, notably when it is a 'joint work.' Each is said to be co-owner of the copyright, with each having all the usual rights of the copyrighted owner… provided that any income from such uses is shared with the other. In rare situations… it may be proper to treat a work as a product of the joint authorship of the faculty member and his or institution, so that both will have a shared interest in the copyright" (http://www.aaup.org/stcopyrt.htm).

The continuous advent of new technologies has contributed to some uncertainties as to who has copyright ownership of materials developed for distance education courses. This conflict is rooted in the interdependent role that the faculty accept within the "systems approach" to distance education that entails working with a group of instructional technologists, graphic designers, course developers and research and evaluators in developing distance education courses (Moore and Kearsley, 1996; Boston, 1992). Should the institution choose to employ such a staff of professionals in order to develop and deliver distance education courses, then, the institution has a stronger rationale to claim a "co-ownership of rights." (http://www.aaup.org/stcopyrt.htm).

Thus, the literature illustrates the risk faculty are taking when they contribute to collaborative works. They may jeopardize their intellectual property rights for portions of materials they created and their collaborative contributions may not meet the criteria of the college's reward system that recognizes primarily individual efforts in scholarly research and publications.

Delimitations:

This study will be limited to surveying faculty and division chairs at a community college consisting of five campuses on the East coast of the United States. The researcher does not have the time and resources to survey the entire faculty in the state community college system. The survey will only focus on faculty's desire and interest in distance education and will not ask them to compare or contrast these experiences with their classroom experience.

Limitations of Study:

Results of this study should be generalizable to the following populations: community colleges that are located in large metropolitan areas and have a small percentage of faculty who teach distance education courses. This survey is being conducted during the community college's self-study and seven months prior to an accreditation review by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Subsequently, during this self-study, many faculty have a heavier workload due to various roles and assignments related to the self-study. Therefore, the researcher questions if conducting the survey at this time will affect the survey response rate.

The community college where this study was conducted offers courses via distance education using four methods: (1) written correspondence courses through the use of the United States Postal Service; (2) Blackboard via the internet; (3) tele-courses; (4) audio visual courses. Tele-courses are delivered through the seven cable television systems currently available in the state where the community college operates. The audio-visual courses are provided through an a-synchronous learning network Blackboard 5 is a comprehensive and flexible e-Learning software platform that delivers a course management system, and, with a Level Two or Level Three license, a customizable institution-wide portal and online communities. In addition, a Level Three license includes advanced integration tools and APIs to seamlessly integrate Blackboard 5 with existing institution systems. The College's Technical Application Center provides online training; video conferencing schedules and resources; technology application tips; online technology resources; free software downloads for all faculty and staff.

This study did not ask faculty to identify which type of distance education delivery system they used to transmit their courses. Thus, the reader can interpret any reference that faculty make to their distance education courses within the context of the delivery systems previously cited.

Definition of Terms:

Academic Department: Academic department refers to each of the department housed within the academic divisions of the five community college campuses. Each division located on the five campuses may have a different configuration of academic departments. For example, The Division of Business and Public Services at Campus A houses business management, finance, information technology, accounting, real estate, administration of justice, legal assisting and marketing. Campus B houses these departments mentioned above with fine arts and houses them in two different divisions: the Division of Performing Arts and Public Services and the Division of Business Technologies.

Academic Division: Academic Division refers to the body that houses academic departments. Department chair persons report directly to division chairs who report to the provost who oversees the particular campus. Division chairpersons at community colleges are the equivalent of academic deans at a university.

Academic Division Chairpersons: Academic division chairpersons oversee all the academic departments and department chairpersons who report to them. The assignment of teaching loads and distribution of related work, consistent with approved state and college guidelines, within a given division, is the responsibility of the academic division chair. Further, overall productivity in the total division workload is the responsibility of the division chair. The rationale for allocation of future faculty and staff positions may be significantly related to productivity and accountability of a given division (Community College System Faculty Handbook, p. 52). Each division chair is expected to teach one course annually (Community College System Faculty Handbook, p. 55).

Academic disciplines: Academic discipline refers to the various academic concentrations within degree programs at the community college. For example, information technology, business management, nursing, accounting, etc.

Advanced Statistical Package for the Social Sciences: The statistical package SPSS is widely used in the social sciences for data analysis including quantitative methods, research methods and education administration.

Classroom Faculty: Faculty who responded to survey for this study and whose teaching loads for the fall semester of 2001 consist only of classroom courses. These faculty may never have taught distance courses or they may have previously taught distance courses.

Compensation: Compensation is salary plus other monetary payments including stipend and merit pay as well as non-financial components, such as decreased workload, recognition, and research and scholarship (Yuker, 1984).

Degree program: Degree program refers to the following undergraduate associate degree programs offered by the community college where this study was conducted: A.S. (associate of science), A.A.S. (associate of applied science), A.A.A. (Associates in Applied Arts); A.A. (Associates in Arts)

Distance Education: Distance education is an organizational process that results in learning through planned experiences with two main themes: the educator and learner are separated by physical distance, possibly separated by time, and information technologies play a key role in maintaining the connection between them. Examples of information technologies now used for this purpose are: interactive audio, Blackboard, video or computer conferencing, broadcast live video, recorded videotapes, and CD-ROMS, virtual reality, simulations, chat-rooms, live boards, email interactive web-sites, on-line testing and self assessment, synchronous and a-synchronous courses held on the World Wide Web, written correspondence courses and computer aided courses (Betts, 1998).

Distance Faculty: Faculty who responded to the survey for this study and whose teaching loads for the fall semester of 2001 comprise all distance courses or include a combination of classroom and distance courses.

Evaluation of Faculty Teaching in the Office of Distance Education: Faculty assigned to teach part of their load through the Department of Distance Learning are annually evaluated by the director of this office. The Director of Distance Learning's comments are forwarded to the division chairs for inclusion in the evaluation of faculty members from their division (Community College Faculty Handbook, p. 129)

The Office of Distance Education: The Department of Distance Education is responsible for the delivery of distance education programs at the community college where this study was conducted. The department's mission is to design and implement excellent and innovative instruction and delivery systems including formats that combine distance education with classroom, independent study, or individualized learning. The Department of Distance Education uses various technologies including television, video, audio, and internet for instruction and student and faculty interaction. The Department also provides instructional support for campuses in the use of interactive television technologies. The Department draws upon academic and student services from the campuses, but functions as a separate administrative entity. Teaching faculty from all five campuses teach part of their workload through the Department of Distance Education and the student enrollment is credited to the campuses. The Department of Distance Education represents the community college as a member of the State Distance Education Network and has responsibility for promoting the sharing of the community college's courses among the state colleagues (Community College Faculty Handbook, p.33).

Extrinsic Motivation: Extrinsic motivation refers to an individual's desire to participate in a given activity in something other than the activity itself (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Reward contingencies include social status, money, recognition, food, etc.

Faculty: Faculty includes regular full-time faculty who hold tenured positions, tenure accruing positions and contract positions. The population of faculty for this study are divided into two groups: those who teach distance education and classroom courses and those who only teach classroom courses.

Faculty Participants in Distance Education: refers to those faculty who are teaching, co-teaching, designing and co-designing distance education courses during the fall semester of 2001.

Faculty Non-Participants in Distance Education: Non-participants refers to those faculty who are not involved in the creation or delivery of distance education courses during the fall semester of 2001.

Faculty Workload: Faculty workload is a term that includes all activities that take time of college professors and which are directly or indirectly related to their professional duties, responsibilities and interests. Faculty workload includes: "preparation for teaching, actual classroom instruction, creating and grading examinations and assignments, reading, research and/or creative work, advising students, professional reading, committee work, departmental and division meetings, professional conferences and any combination of a variety of other professional activities in which faculty members normally engage." (Yuker, 1984, p. 1).

Faculty Workload (Referred to as Faculty Load in the Community College Faculty Handbook)

The primary responsibility of a faculty member at the community college where this study was conducted is to provide quality instruction to students. Good teaching is demonstrated by working with students in classrooms, laboratories, individual conferences, and related activities to help students develop their interests and abilities to the fullest. To accomplish this goal the following workloads are expected of faculty:

Classes:

1. Faculty teaching loads during the academic year will include such combinations of day, evening and weekend classes as the needs of the College require. Twelve to fifteen (12 to 15) and fifteen to twenty (15 to 20) contact hours (a contact hour is defined as an hour faculty spend with students in a class setting, whether lecture or lab) per semester are required of all full-time faculty. When the number of credit hours falls below twelve (12) because of the number of laboratory hours involved, the number of contact hours should be increased to bring the teaching load to the minimum of twelve (12) credit hours – utilizing the standard of three (3) laboratory hours equals one (1) credit hour, depending upon the nature of the course taught or to a maximum of twenty-four (24) contact hours.

2. Faculty teaching loads should be calculated for the academic year, with a teaching load less than or in excess of normal for one semester, being compensated with adjustments in the teaching load in the subsequent semester.

3. A faculty teaching load may be adjusted by the college to take into consideration as the use of instructional assistants, team teaching, non-traditional instructional delivery systems, special assignments and curriculum development. Curriculum development should be primarily for the development of a new program or new course in a program and/or the complete revision of an existing course or program.

4. Faculty loads will include such combinations of day, evening, weekend and the Office of Distance Education as the needs of the College require. This will include such combinations of day, evening and weekend classes as necessary to assure that there is a proper representation of full-time faculty during all instructional times.

5. A faculty load may include approved educational program development projects (See section 3.5000C.2) that include:

   a. Instructional development projects approved by the provost to improve teaching materials, methods of presentation, and instructional competence.

   b. curriculum development projects approved by the provost to improve curricular offerings. Such projects should be primarily for the development of a new program or a new course in a new program and/or the complete revision of an existing course or program. When a faculty member's load includes educational program development projects, the division chair may request approval for such reassigned time by the College president (see section 3.5000 .C.2). Curriculum development projects may be funded by grant stipends. Credit hour equivalencies will be applied to the faculty member's workload report; a twenty percent reduction in teaching load represents, for purposes of such an equivalence, a full day's work of eight hours per week to be spent on the approved project (Community College Faculty Handbook pg. 49-50).

6. Classes with enrollments of 45 to 70 shall be afforded a teaching credit value of one and a half times the standard teaching credit load value for such a class. Classes with enrollments of 71-96 shall be afforded teaching value of twice the standard teaching credit load value for such a class. Classes with enrollments of 97 or more shall be afforded a teaching credit value of two and one half times the teaching credit load value. (Community College Faculty Handbook pg.52).

Faculty Workload for Faculty Who are Teaching through the Office of Distance Education (Referred to as Faculty Load in the Community College Faculty Handbook): Teaching load for the Department of Distance Learning courses will follow the same workload scale as other courses taught at the College. Workloads will be calculated separately for each distance education course. Courses with enrollments of 25 to 44 are given a teaching credit load value equal to one comparable campus course. Sections of the same course taught by the same instructor but using different formats (i.e. tele-course vs. internet) will be considered different courses and the workload will be calculated separately for each. Small enrollment classes may be collapsed into other courses. The director of the Department of Distance Learning, in consultation with the faculty member and the appropriate division chair, may make other workload adjustments as necessary (Community College Faculty Handbook, p. 52).

Inhibit: Inhibit is defined as to restrain, hold back or curb (Webster's dictionary, 1964, p.753).

Inhibitor: An inhibitor is defined as a person or thing that inhibits, slows, or prevents (Webster's Dictionary, 1964, p. 754).

Intellectual Property Agreement at the Community College where the Primary Data Collection was Conducted:

Any intellectual property that can be copyrighted, or patented, regardless of format, is covered by the College Policy, published in the *Administrative Services Manual*, section 29. The policy applies to all College employees including any students paid by the College paid to produce intellectual property.

The College may claim an interest in intellectual property with market value produced by College employees, when it was produced within the course of College employment and with the substantial use of state facilities or funds. The College encourages and recognizes the creative efforts of its employees by sharing any financial returns equitably with its creators. The policies and procedures set forth in section 29 of the *Administrative Services Manual,* address procedures for notification, determination of equities and conditions of ownership for patents and copyrights (Community College Faculty Handbook, p. 96).

Interactivity: Interactivity involves communication in distance education between faculty and students, and among students themselves (Sherry, 1996). Interactivity can be accomplished via telephone, one-way video, two-way video audio, two-way video, or graphics interactivity, two-way computer hook-ups, or responsive terminals, email, and chat-rooms. (USDLA, 1996).

Intrinsic Motivation: Intrinsic motivation refers to an individual's desire to participate in a given activity where the reward is the activity itself. (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Intrinsic motivation comes out of curiosity, a sense of challenge, or inherent satisfactions that accompany the activity absent external rewards (e.g., money, praise, food, etc.). (Deci & Ryan, 1985).

Likert Scale: A Likert Scale is used in survey formats where a statement is followed by a scale of potential responses. Subjects to check the place on the scale that best indicates their beliefs or opinions about the statement. (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989).

Merit Pay: Merit-pay is a form of faculty compensation. Although it is not used nationwide, merit-pay is the practice of granting annual salary increases intended to reflect the quality of faculty performance (Hansen, 1988).

At the community college where this study was conducted salary increases for faculty personnel are approved by the General Assembly and are allocated according to the College's merit plan. The president decides, with advice from the College Forum, on the increase for promotion. To be eligible for any salary increase, a faculty employee must receive a "good", "very good" or excellent rating … for the previous academic year. A promotion increase for faculty members who have been recommended and who have satisfied all requirements for promotion will receive the promotion increment increasing their salary on July 1 for administrative professional faculty and August 16 for teaching faculty. If the faculty member's salary with the promotion is below the minimum for the newly attained rank, resulting from the promotion, then the salary will be raised to the minimum for that rank (p. 110 Community College Faculty Handbook, section 6.5600).

Non-traditional student: This is a student who has one or more of the following characteristics: delayed enrollment into postsecondary education; attends part-time; financially independent; works full-time while enrolled; has dependents other than a spouse; is a single parent; or has not obtained a standard high school diploma (NCES, 1997).

Open Enrollment: The college policy which allows any student with a high school diploma to register for classes at the community college.

Overload: Teaching load adjustments shall be expressed in terms of an equivalent teaching load for the purpose of computing a faculty member's total teaching load. For the purposes of calculating when a faculty member will receive overload pay, the teaching load is expressed in teaching credits (lecture hour = 1 teaching credit; laboratory hour = 0.5 teaching credit). Overload is paid for all teaching credits over 30 for the academic year, and for over 10 for the summer session. (Community College Faculty Handbook, p. 50 under 3.5000 Faculty Loads, Classes.)

Professional Development of Faculty: Professional development is that growth in qualifications which faculty members achieve beyond the qualifications upon which they were granted their first appointment to the community college faculty. It is characterized by increasing competence to perform the particular functions of the professional function of the professional function to which they have been appointed.

The College believes that the professional development of faculty members is essential in the continuing improvement of its services to the community and in the accomplishment of its goals. Accordingly, the college supports both policies and procedures leading to professional development and expects faculty members to initiate appropriate action to develop their own professional competence.

Although the college provides some support through available funding and materials to enable the faculty to develop professionally, the primary responsibility for professional development lies with the individual faculty member. Similarly, the responsibilities of supervisors at each level in the college administration is to lead faculty and staff through example, by their participation, support and encouragement, of both the individual and the unit in professional development planning and activities. Supervisors should regularly assist and encourage the faculty and staff members in their area to improve their professional effectiveness and to organize appropriate professional development work. (Community College Faculty Handbook, p. 136-137.)

Promotion of Faculty: For faculty members to be eligible for promotion, they must meet the minimum criteria for the next rank as set forth in the column of the Community College-29 which governs the degree or certificate program in which the faculty members' primary teaching field falls. Such criteria must be substantiated by the faculty member's official personnel file (Community College Faculty Handbook, p. 94).

The faculty and supervisor will meet annually and discuss the faculty member's goals for the coming year. These goals will relate to the faculty member's basic responsibilities as defined in the Faculty Handbook and in the supplemental campus and divisional position descriptions and the criteria set forth in the Community College Policy Manual. The goals may also relate to one or more of the following areas: (1) professional activities related to discipline, (2) professional activities designed to improve teaching effectiveness; (3) college and campus activities; (4) community service. The faculty member's performance and progress toward achieving these goals should be discussed by the faculty member and supervisor during the evaluation cycle. (Community College Faculty Handbook, p. 128).

Rolling Admissions: The college policy which allows a student to enroll in a distance course at any point during the calendar year.

Systems Approach: A team of experts (content experts, course designers, graphic designers, and research and evaluation experts) who can ensure that the components of distance education courses are fully integrated and compliment each other (Moore & Kearsley, 1996).

Teaching Development Support: The Learning Resource Center on each campus supports instructional development by providing materials, equipment, and staff assistance in educational technology and design (Community College Faculty Handbook, p. 57).

Television Services: Community College television production, satellite down-linking, and two way video that link the five campuses are provided by Campus Audiovisual /Instructional Technology Services along with the College Telecommunications Center. Television services include the Community College compressed video network for instruction and teleconferences. The Telecommunications Center is located on the community college campus A and provides a complete television production, editing and transmission facility. The Telecommunications Center provides a direct link to most cable TV systems for credit tele-courses and other college programming. The center also connects with College's satellite uplink.

Organization of the Study:

Chapter I contains the introduction, statement of the problem, statement of purpose, methodology, research questions, research hypotheses, need for the study, delimitations, limitations, definitions of terms and organization of the study.

Chapter II reviews the literature that is relevant to the historical development of distance learning, the impact technology has had upon the delivery of college courses, how distance education has changed the faculty role, teaching methods and learning strategies, faculty attitudes toward distance education, intellectual property rights, rewards and support for faculty engaged in distance learning. Factors that motivate faculty to participate in distance education and factors that inhibit their participation and a list of best practices for distance education as recommended by the American Association of University Professors are also included in chapter two.

Chapter III outlines the methodology and instrument used and data analysis of the pilot study. This chapter also includes the following information regarding the primary data collection for the dissertation: (1) an overview of the purpose of this study; (2) a description of the population and sample; (3) sampling methods that were used; (4) research questions and hypotheses; (5) instrumentation; (6) survey outlines; (7) reliability and validity; (8) ethical considerations; (9) permission to use survey and make modifications; (10) data collection procedures, and prescription of data analysis employed in this study.

Chapter IV presents the research findings: demographics of the respondents, and a summary of the findings.

Chapter V presents a summary, conclusions drawn from this study, implications for practice, limitations, recommendations for future research and summary.

CHAPTER II

Introduction

The expansion of technology and the internet, and the increased number of corporate – university partnerships, coupled with individuals' needs to simultaneously engage in lifelong learning and professional development while juggling family and work responsibilities have all contributed strongly to the growth of distance education (Mitchell, 1999; Gandolfo, 1998; Davis and Smith, 1996; Dillon and Walsh, 1992; Whitworth, 1999; Green, 1999; Smith, et. al., 2000; Wagner et. al., 1999; Ayer and Smith, 1998; McManus and Lyne, 1992). Dislocations brought about by international trade imbalances or mergers or layoffs that occur within multinational firms will directly impact workers and make them feel less comfortable about their employment status. (Johnson, 1992). Management strategies also have changed, equipment and processes are becoming more complex and advances in technology all call for a workforce of adults who have the intellectual skills to learn new ways of examining old problems (Drucker, 1996). As a result of the demands of the workplace, workers will be expected to continually engage in education in order to protect themselves against an uncertain employment future or risk unemployment (El-Khawas, 1999; Johnson, 1992). Distance learning, through a myriad of new technologies, provides a means by which adults can continue to expand their knowledge base in an age when society still deems learning, working, societal and familial roles as linear experiences.

Historical Development of Distance Learning

Throughout the history of the United States higher education has attempted to respond to society's needs for knowledge and skills as the demands of a global economy, and job market shift. The Morrill Act of 1862 marked the first piece of federal legislation that provided for educational accessibility for the average citizen, who might otherwise not have gone to college. The Morrill Act was historical in several senses: (1) It was the first legislation of its kind to appropriate federal funds to state colleges; (2) It enabled universities to offer practical curricula of agriculture and technology that differed from the classical and theoretical curricula of private colleges located in the Eastern part of the United States and (3) this type of practical curriculum was more serviceable to middle class farming communities, from which many of its students came. (Brubacher & Rudy, 1968). Most importantly, the Morrill Act of 1862 placed higher education within the financial and geographic grasp of average Americans who couldn't afford the cost of tuition or the loss of their sons' labor from their family farms.

The creation of state institutions through the Morrill Act of 1862 enabled colleges to be built in small towns across the country, near where many Americans lived, and allowed these colleges to offer programs that were more pertinent to the industrial and agricultural needs of these populations. Prior to the Civil War, aside from land grant institutions, correspondence studies were the most common form of education for adults who wanted to pursue a college education, but did not have the opportunity or finances to attend college full-time. In 1883 a group of thirty-two professors from East coast colleges such as Harvard and John Hopkins and land grant institutions, including, the University of Wisconsin, banded together to form a "Correspondence University." The term university in this case did not represent a collegiate body, but rather represented the range of academic disciplines taught by each of the faculty members. Although the base of its operation was Cornell University, these courses were not sponsored by any university and therefore the faculty did not have any power to confer degrees. Rather, these courses were viewed as a means to supplement classes offered by all the institutions participating in the "correspondence university" and provide students with college level courses who otherwise would not attend college (http://webster.commnet.edu/roger /history.htm; Portman, 1978).

The "Correspondence University" was not nationally recognized as was the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle (CLSC), the first formally organized adult education program. CLSC began as a Sunday school for teachers, but quickly developed into a four-year home study course. Subjects included a wide range of liberal arts, psychology and astronomy. The first class enrolled 4,800 students in 1882 and expanded to over 20,000 enrollments by 1884. As enrollments grew, the Chautauquan, a monthly magazine devoted to culture, science and literature, included a list of books and articles that students were expected to read. The CLSC organized many local chapters that attracted a wide range of students including professionals, lawyers and doctors, factory workers and housewives. CLSC also introduced many of the teaching practices that educators now associate with andragogy and distance education (Knowles, 1984 & Moore and Kearsley, 1996). Groups of CLSC students would meet weekly to discuss the readings, and randomly appoint different students each week to serve as discussion facilitators, thereby learning from each other (http://members.aol.com/Alphadang /clsc.html). Later in the 1880's the State University of New York empowered CLSC to award undergraduate, graduate and doctoral degrees (Knowles, 1977).

The Chautauqua movement influenced many universities such as John Hopkins, the University of California and the State University of New York to develop extension programs. In 1891 the State University of New York passed the University Extension Act which signaled the state's commitment to state extension education and provided funds to support the effort (Portman, 1978). By the 1880's these state institutions had generated the beginnings of distance and adult education through their extension sites which brought programs to local towns and cities. Thus, adults were able to access these courses more easily without having to disrupt their life roles and responsibilities and without the added inconvenience of travel. These extension sites changed two assumptions in the culture of higher education, that people could only attend college during their late adolescence when being a full-time student defined their role in life and that adults had to travel some distance to access a college education.

By the early 1890's the University of Chicago introduced a new model of adult/distance education that was soon emulated by many land grant institutions. This new model categorized courses into three divisions by virtue of their delivery systems: (1) classroom-study; (2) lecture-study; (3) correspondence courses. Classroom-study introduced the beginnings of the "university college" model which offered courses and degrees exclusively on the weekends and evenings and introduced the idea of offering classes year round including summer session semesters; lecture-study was an arrangement where faculty would travel to different extension sites and give lectures on different topics and correspondence study allowed students to complete degrees at a distance through US mail (http://www-news.uchicago.edu/resources/brief-history.html; Portman, 1978). Faculty who taught through university extensions had to be cognizant of how adult learning styles differed from those of children. Through their teaching faculty sought to enable adults to integrate their life experience with the content of the course in which they were enrolled (Knowles, 1977).

By the 1900's America's focus on conquering new westward frontiers had been replaced by a progressive spirit that called for an immediate focus upon communal and intellectual efforts that would create and preserve a better quality of life for all Americans (Cantor & Cantor, 1998). This progressive spirit was clearly visible in the creation of the "Wisconsin Idea" which embodied William Raney Harper's philosophy of "bringing a university to all the people by extending its direct influence far beyond its own campus" (p. 165 Brubacher and Rudy, 1968). This vision resulted in the establishment of forty education extension centers across the state of Wisconsin by 1913.

The President of the University of Wisconsin, Charles Van Hise, viewed the university extension as the part of the institution which could best provide service to the community "… This then is the purpose of University Extension - to carry light and opportunity to every human being in all parts of the nation; this is the only adequate ideal of service for the university."(http://www1.uwex.edu/about/history.cfm).

By 1910 the university extension site movement had generated over 5,000 enrollments in correspondence courses, and this growth continued till the early 1920's. Simultaneously as extension sites grew, the faculty role within the extension sites changed as well. Their mobility was a special feature of the Wisconsin Extension program, and they were also asked to serve as advisors to state boards, where their special knowledge was needed. The Wisconsin Extension Program served as a model for Minnesota, California, Michigan and North Carolina, all of whom developed similar programs. (http://www1.uwex.edu/about/history.cfm).

However, while the Wisconsin movement was extremely influential in the development of extension sites, it still did not resolve the questions which higher education continues to ponder, even in the twenty-first century: (1) what degree of service to the public is sufficient; (2) through what administrative sector of the university should this service be offered and (3) in what subject content should it be offered (Portman, 1978).

Many colleges reflected upon these very questions as America entered its second decade of the twentieth century and enrollments at extension sites began to decline. As the types of learners attracted to extension sites changed, so too did their educational needs. Population centers were shifting from rural to urban areas, immigration quotas were decreasing and transportation (the automobile) and communication (phone) were becoming more sophisticated. Despite all of these developments, higher education still had to reach out to adult learners, rather than expecting adults to conform to the colleges' mode of course delivery. As a result of changing demographics, higher education responded to adult learners' needs by increasing the number and size of evening colleges, using radio as a way of transmitting class lectures, and creating public junior colleges whose tuition was more affordable than private four-year colleges (Cantor & Cantor, 1997).

Access to higher education continued to expand with the growth of junior colleges at the beginning of the twentieth century. These junior colleges were designed to be both an extension of high school and provide the first two years of a baccalaureate degree. William Raney Harper first designed the concept of the junior college for students, who would not have otherwise gone to college, to receive higher education and practical levels of training (Brubacher and Rudy, 1968).

Throughout the twentieth century correspondence courses, two-year colleges and evening colleges at four-year universities have continued to be the predominant means by which higher education has continued to reach adult students. Once more technology served as a means to bridge the gap between adults' need for and their limited access to higher education. The national railways network became operational in the 1880's, just as correspondence course enrollments were increasing, thereby maintaining a more regular delivery of course materials via U.S. Mail (Cantor & Cantor, 1998). During the turn of the century radio was a popular mechanism by which lectures were transmitted. However, as radio usage increased universities found the cost of equipment to be prohibitive and radio stations found profitable businesses were a more lucrative use of their airtime for ventures rather than non-profit education offerings (http://www.current.org/ coop/index.html).

Network television was an effective way of reaching a wide audience with educational programming during late 1940's through the late 1960's (http://www.current. org/history/). Larned (1988) estimated that by 1961, as many as 117 colleges and universities were offering courses through television. Educational television programs began to migrate toward cable and public television in the late 1970's as the networks, like radio stations in the 1930's, realized that their profit margin could be larger if they sold time to corporate advertising. The advent of the Internet in the early 1990's generated the development of on-line courses on the World Wide Web. The most recent statistics available through the National Center for Educational Statistics reveal that as of

1995, one third of the colleges and universities across the United States offered distance education programs (http://nces.ed.gov/pubs99/condition99/indicator-31.html). The development of the Internet has forever changed how higher education responds to its students, from the services institutions provide to the delivery of their courses (Wagner, et. al., 1999).

Impact of technology on Lifestyles and Education

"Technological change is what many have said is the only constant in our work today" (Kubala, 2000). As technology changes our need to adapt to these changes increases. Information technology is not just contained within the web, computers or the Internet – it is integrated into all aspects of our lives (Green, 1999; Hakim, et. al, 1999). Technology has now linked lives together more intimately than we could have ever imagined. People are now working and interacting on-line with each other from around the world, even when they may not be familiar with each other's cultural backgrounds (Ehrmann, 1999). The pressing need for workers with these skills has fueled an increasing enrollment of adult students across the country who are returning to college to update their skills and knowledge base in order to secure higher paying jobs that are technology based (Drucker, 1994).

As the United States approaches the 21st century and is reaping the benefits of a strong knowledge based economy, Americans are continuing to seek higher levels of education in order to upgrade their skills and secure better paid, higher skilled jobs (Gladieux & Swall, 1999). The U.S. Department of Commerce projects that 70% to 90% of the proportion of future jobs will require some form of postsecondary education, as the job market continues to rely upon credentials and certification as a means of measuring worker's knowledge base and skill level (http://www.esa.doc.gov/de2k.htm).

Higher Education's Response to Learners Changing Needs through Program Delivery

As workers confront the future of engaging in a variety of careers over their lifetime, they turn to providers of post secondary education as a means to prepare for these career changes. Millions of adult students are returning to colleges in order to upgrade skills, seek certifications or completely change careers. (Green, 1999). These students are expecting colleges to respond to their learning needs so they can maintain a competitive skill and knowledge base in an economy where the values of certain skills are constantly changing.

In the midst of economic growth, technological change and an increasingly diverse student body, how does higher education respond to students' needs? Colleges and universities cannot assume that they are immune from socioeconomic forces or that the creation of knowledge is not a technologically aided activity (Privateer, 1990). Colleges must not only respond to learners' academic programmatic needs that are driven by the economy (i.e., degree programs in information systems technology), they must also deliver these programs in a manner that suits students' learning and lifestyle needs. As adult's participation in higher education is fluid, so too are the roles and different kinds of relationships they have throughout their life (Ford, 1987). Learning is no longer a linear activity that is limited to a particular chronological age; rather people now simultaneously carry out responsibilities of other life roles (i.e., employment, family roles, etc.) while they engage in formal learning (Knowles, 1984). Therefore, programs should be designed to remove barriers that are mostly experienced in conventional education programs such as location of classes, time of classes, cost of travel and fees so that students can simultaneously engage in learning and other life responsibilities and roles (Ayer and Smith, 1998).

Distance education provides just such an environment that increases learners' access and provides them with opportunities to become skilled learners by taking more responsibility for their own learning, both individually and collectively (Newsome, 1999 & Ehrmann, 199; Grasinger, 1999). Through distance learning, students can access learning opportunities when it is convenient for them, rather than configuring their lives to fit the routine or availability of educational programs (Mitchell, 1999).

Changes in Faculty Roles and Teaching Strategies in Distance Education

While higher education has attempted to react to economic demands by providing more skilled workers, it is questionable if institutions of higher learning have addressed the impact these external demands have had upon the internal center of the university - the faculty. Many facets of faculty's roles have changed as a result of technology (Strain, 1987; Gunawardena, 1992; Baldwin, 1998).

The development of distance education technologies has created conditions that require faculty to adapt to a new way of teaching and communicating with their students. In some distance education settings, instructors do not have the usual face-to-face contact with their students that exist in traditional classroom settings. Thus, special means must be devised for assigning, guiding, and evaluating students' work. In order to communicate with students instructors frequently utilize sophisticated and expensive technological devices which are not under instructors' exclusive control and often require special technical knowledge that instructors may not fully possess.

Distance education requires not only that faculty learn how to use new technologies, it also requires a paradigm shift in how educators orchestrate the act of learning (Dillon and Walsh, 1992; Hassenplug and Harnish, 1998).

> [t] he emergence of increasingly student-centered learning activities in the 1970's facilitated by new instructional technology introduced in the 1980's contributing to a dramatic evolution in faculty roles raises fundamental questions within the professorate about how it will contribute to the teaching-learning process in the 1990's and beyond. (Beaudoin, 1990).

Alexander Astin, as early as 1985, before the evolution of internet-based courses, stated the importance of creating opportunities for active, rather than passive learning opportunities. "Students learn not by attending lectures or taking notes, but by becoming involved with the content to be learned. Continued reliance upon teaching strategies that encourage only passive attention to the content is a practice that warrants further attention." Moore (1996), almost a decade later argued that instructors teaching in a distance learning mode need to engage their students in active learning through learner-content interaction, learner-instructor interaction and learner-learner interaction. Through these three modes of learning students become more self-directed and responsible for their own learning. Students create their own framework of knowledge or interpretation of information, and engage in questioning, discussion and exchange of interpretations with instructors and other learners.

In addition to creating new learning strategies that are more student-centered and learning how to use new technologies, faculty teaching distance courses also must develop their course content and determine how it will be delivered months prior to the course start date. Planning and preparation must be seen as a front-end activity rather than a formative one that continues throughout the course (Wolcott, 1993; Cyrs, 1989). Faculty must decide by what means they will deliver courses, define the content and decide how they will address the content of the course in the time they are allowed. In classroom courses faculty may design an outline of a syllabus and rely on lectures to embellish the content of the syllabus. In a distance setting, faculty cannot afford to be so spontaneous, as course development usually includes a team of experts who need content information from faculty in order to complete their portion of course delivery. Faculty teaching distance courses usually design a topical outline from which they create an extensive syllabus that contains detailed lectures, readings, and interactive activities. This extensive syllabus provides students with direction and guidance they need to engage in self-directed learning, and in discussions and projects with other learners (Davis and Smith, 1996; Wolcott, 1993).

Distance education also requires faculty to plan their courses in advance and pay attention to administrative as well as academic details. One professor who taught a course at Morehead State University recounts how he had to prepare differently for the course he co-taught with another facilitator on compressed video at two university sites. He had to create packets of materials for each site and arrange to have these materials sent to each site. Each week he also had to discuss the materials and learning strategies with his facilitator at the other site and plan alternate activities in the event that their connections to each other's sites failed. In addition, both facilitators had to confirm that the equipment at both sites was compatible (Whitworth, 1999).

Faculty also have to think creatively and be adaptive in distance learning environments. In order to determine that students grasp the material, the professor who taught a compressed video course at Morehead State University designed a set of note cards with students' names on them so he could identify students at distance sites and involve them in class discussions (Whitworth, 1999). Instructors teaching in any type of distance education need to make additional efforts to communicate regularly with their students by phone, fax or email (Hassenplug and Harnish, 1998; Kubala, 2000).

Wolcott (1993) notes that it is particularly challenging for college faculty to focus on instructional activities, as most faculty are more likely to be trained in content areas rather than in curriculum and lesson planning. It is also a somewhat foreign practice for most faculty to plan interactive strategies in advance of course delivery as they are accustomed to relying upon verbal cues and the spontaneity of classroom discussion to serve as a catalyst for interaction.

In a study that Wolcott (1993) conducted at Utah State University the eleven distance faculty who responded to her survey voiced little concern over how the medium of course delivery would affect the course design and method(s) of instruction. She attributed faculty's lack of priority to course design and instruction as stemming from two factors: the lack of training these faculty received and the perception amongst some faculty that distance and classroom instruction should be similar in their course design, content and implementation.

Dillon, Hengst and Zoller (1991) conducted a study similar to Wolcott's (1993) at the Oklahoma Televised Instruction System that examined instructional strategies used by faculty teaching within the state televised instructional system. Surveys were sent to one hundred and sixty one faculty and eighty-eight faculty responded. They were given a list of four teaching strategies and asked to rank themselves on a Likert scale of 1 to 4 as to which strategy they used most often in their distance education courses. The four teaching strategies included: (1) instructor-centered strategies (lecture, direct questioning and demonstration); (2) interactive strategies (class discussion, group projects, and peer teaching); (3) programmed instruction (activities in which the content is divided into sequential steps so that the student is presented with information and then asked to answer questions about this information); (4) experiential strategies (laboratory methods, role playing, or any simulation of a real situation) (Weston & Cranton, 1986 in Dillon, Hengst and Zoller, 1991). Results revealed that instructor-centered strategies were used most frequently with a mean of 3.47 and interactive strategies were used far less frequently, with overall means of 1.92, 1.59 and 1.36. Faculty replied that their use of instructor-centered strategies was due to the problems they encountered with technology which made it difficult to use more interactive strategies. Poor audio, and fixed seating contributed to their inability to use more interactive learning strategies in their distance education courses. Faculty also cited problems with administrative and clerical support. They also added that the limited distance training they did receive focused only on the use of technology, and did not address elements relating to course design, instruction or the distance learner.

Teaching and Learning Strategies in Distance Education

Successful and effective distance teaching is contingent upon a different set of skills than those that are used in traditional classroom environments (Dillon and Walsh, 1992). Thus, learning will never again be completely defined as synchronous, time specified, interdependent exercise. The former model of the teacher-classroom experience will still continue, but it will not be the dominant medium of education. Technology can free faculty from the bounds of time and space, but only if they learn to measure their productivity in new ways, mainly by what students learn, instead of how they learn, where they learn, and for how long faculty teach them (Plater, 1999).

Chute, Balthazar and Poston, (1988) studied instructors who used an audio graphics system at a corporation to conduct classes. They identified the following characteristics as contributing to effective distance instruction: (1) knowledge of basic learning theory; (2) skilled organization and management of materials and the corporate learning environment; (3) effective verbal and non-verbal presentation methods; (4) variety and use of questioning techniques; (4) successful coordination of group activities; (5) expertise in subject area; (6) the ability to respond to trainees as individuals with a recognition of their knowledge and (7) the ability to work cooperatively with a team of distance education experts to develop courses.

Peters (1983) equates the instructional activities involved in distance education to those activities involved in an industrial process. He describes the division of labor in distance education in four parts: (1) course production (faculty create course materials, editors and instructional designers assist faculty, graphic artists design the layout and illustration); (2) the evaluation system (a person other than the faculty member or evaluator may not be the person who designed the course material); (3) a record keeping system and (4) other student services such as counseling and advising. Peters reasons that this division of labor is necessary if higher education is going to bring quality instruction to students who attend classes at extension sites, or through distance education.

However, this division of labor does not mean that faculty can completely rely upon instructional technologists to deliver their courses. On the contrary, faculty should be able to identify and recognize technologies' strengths and weaknesses and select the most appropriate delivery mechanism for a particular lesson (Gunawardena, 1992). More important, than just learning how to use the technology appropriately, faculty need to learn how to personalize their instruction, regardless of the technology they use, and incorporate student involvement activities into their instruction. Faculty who integrate more student involvement or collaborative learning in their distance education courses also find the use of this pedagogy improves their classroom teaching as well (Dillon and Walsh, 1992; Wolcott, 1992).

When Carr (2001) interviewed a faculty member at Columbia University about his decision to transform his courses to a distance education medium he cited the different techniques he had to master. He spoke about how he missed the face to face contact with his students and the control he had over the flow of material which he presented to his students. As he began to teach his course on line he learned that many students don't learn in a linear fashion, so he had to design his course in such a manner that allowed them to gain access to content in a way that made sense to them.

Grossman (1989) credits the secondary status that distance education receives at most institutions to higher education's failure of recognizing that the culture of distance education is at odds with the traditional academic culture. Grossman (1989) perceives the systems approach to course design and delivery as forcing faculty to relinquish their "intellectual proprietorship," which is highly valued within the culture of higher education and rewarded by the academy.

A national survey on faculty attitudes towards distance education, revealed that the more faculty knew about technology, the more highly they rated it for use in their teaching (Clarke, 1993; 1999; Dillon and Walsh, 1992). As faculty members design the structure of a distance education course, they should select technologies and teaching methodologies that compliment each other and make the learning environment more stimulating. One professor, who was transforming his course from a classroom setting to a two-way interactive system, decided to change his teaching orientation from knowledge transmission to learner-centered. He accomplished this change by putting his lectures onto audiocassettes and engaging his students in collaborative learning activities during class time. In order to make this change in instruction methods, his role also had to change from teacher at the head of the classroom to that of a facilitator who worked with the students to guide them through the discovery of learning (Gunawardena, 1992).

The Systems Approach and the Culture of Collaborative Faculty Efforts

As a result of technology use in education, faculty's roles will continue to change as they devote more time to course preparation and become part of a system of course development (Moore and Kearsley, 1996). This "systems approach" represents a new paradigm in teaching as it requires a team of experts who can ensure that the components of distance education courses are fully integrated and complement each other.

A typical distance education course could include several participants: (1) content experts, (usually the faculty who contribute expertise in the course discipline); (2) instructional designers (those professionals who work with content experts in creating course objectives, selecting course assignments and activities, plotting the general layout of the course and selecting appropriate texts that will coordinate well with the technology used for the course. Instructional designers make certain that course assignments have a mixture of independent, interactive and interdependent activities); (3) graphic designers (experts who will work with the content experts and instructional designers to decide which activities or assignments can best be delivered by a particular type of technology); (4) research and evaluation experts who can evaluate the quality of student learning, how well all course concepts were integrated, and how effectively and efficiently the course was delivered (Moore & Kearsley, 1996; Gunawardena, 1992). The effectiveness of internet based on-line courses is particularly dependent upon this team of experts (Kubala, 2000).

Although the literature suggests a "systems approach" as one method of designing distance education courses, not all colleges and universities engage in this method of distance education delivery. Some institutions that place distance education at the periphery of their missions, may not engage in a systems approach as they consider the resources it requires to be too costly (Dillon and Walsh, 1992; Olcott & Wright, 1995). Institutions that reflect these characteristics may expect their faculty to develop distance education courses on their own time with very few institutional resources.

The degree of success distance education achieves at each institution is proportional to its place within the college mission and the resources it receives. Some institutions that offer distance education courses place distance education at the periphery of their mission, as they view these programs as a means of increasing enrollments without increasing the use of services on campus. While other institutions view distance education programs to be a focal point of a college's mission as they require a massive administrative and fiscal restructuring (Jewett, 2000). In order to support distance learning programs, institutions cannot rely upon an enrollment driven budget to maintain and develop a distance education program. Revenue generated only from enrollments will not meet the upfront costs of equipment and course development. Rather, colleges must commit significant institutional resources and secure annual appropriations for its continued growth and development and provide incentives for instructors and administrators to participate in distance programs (McNeil, 1990).

Support Services for Distance Education Faculty

Regardless of the system a university uses to develop and deliver distance education courses, support services for faculty are vital, but they vary greatly across institutions (Gilcher & Johnson, 1989; Dillon, 1989; Kirby and Garrison, 1989; Scriven, 1986). McNeil (1990) found that even faculty who are most personally motivated to teach distance education will refrain from participating if they do not receive adequate support and training. Professors who teach at a distance must be aware of technical difficulties that students encounter and have access to technical support staff who can quickly address these problems (Gunawardena, 1992).

Betts (1998) addressed the issue of support in her survey of faculty and deans at the George Washington University. Faculty responses to questions addressing suggestions for faculty development programs included (1) a need for more financial, administrative and technical support in distance education course development; (2) workshops that enable them to develop specific skills for facilitating distance education courses, and using and selecting appropriate technology for specific lessons and (3) release time to attend distance education training workshops. Dillon's (1990) findings of faculty's common needs of support reinforced Betts'(1998) findings that faculty sought assistance in (1) preparing course materials; (2) clerical support; (3) coordination in communicating with students at off-campus sites; (4) assistance in marketing their distance education programs and (5) assistance in distributing materials to students enrolled in their distance education courses.

Dillon (1989) and Gilcher and Johnstone (1989) also found that the degree of support faculty receive for distance education programs is proportionate to the mission of the distance education program, the overall institutional mission and the institutional history of distance education delivery. Distance education and technology training for faculty will only be successful if it takes place in an environment that is supportive of faculty's use of technology in their course delivery. Unfortunately, the majority of the literature defines faculty development in distance education as technical training and fails to address faculty attitudes toward distance education, and how faculty can learn and apply new interactive teaching strategies to their distance courses (Parer, 1988; Dillon and Hengst and Zoller, 1991; Cyrs, 1989; Public Service Satellite Consortium, 1988).

Beaudoin (1990) points out that independent study programs that administer self-directed learning programs may find it very difficult to identify a great number of faculty who have distance learning experience. Therefore, it is even more important to provide faculty with orientation and training that will allow them to become more confident in their use of distance learning. The skills and knowledge these faculty must have in order to participate in the design and delivery of distance education programs are very different from the skills necessary to deliver courses in a traditional classroom setting. Consequently, as faculty roles and responsibilities change, so too the reward and institutional support structure should change accordingly. (Harrison et. al., 2000; Garrett, L. & Weiner, B., 1999).

The academy has a duty to provide holistic programs that will enable faculty to cognitively and affectively make the transition from being a knowledge provider to a facilitator of learner-centered programs. Studies of distance education have provided evidence that the faculty who have been able to make this shift in their roles were not only the most successful in their distance education classes but also were more successful in their classroom teaching as well (Grossman, 1989).

By integrating technology into their role of facilitator, faculty can also implement what Chickering and Ehrmann, (1996) describe as the "Seven Principles of Good Practice:" (1) encouraging interaction between faculty and students; (2) developing collaborative learning among students; (3) using active and participatory learning methods; (4) providing timely feedback; (5) allowing students to spend more time on the task of learning; (6) expressing high expectations, and (7) allowing students to engage in different means of learning.

The Impact of Technology Upon the Culture of Higher Education

Chickering (1969, p. 158) makes an interesting observation in regard to institutional mission and change within higher education. "At most colleges, process has taken over, leaving purpose to shift for itself. Objectives rarely surface when questions of policy and practice are raised... Consciousness of purpose has been supplanted by deference to tradition and authority or uncritical acceptance of current practice. Innovation and experimentation ... are often undertaken or borrowed with no apparent thought to institutional objectives."

The integration of distance education into the mission of higher education is the complete antithesis of Chickering's description of how colleges and universities adapt to change and innovation. Distance learning is forcing higher education to examine the objectives that support its purpose. Technology will forever change the traditional model of synchronous learning, which is grounded in specific times and places. Traditional ways of structuring and delivering courses will be examined and new ways of doing old things will be adopted (Plater, 1995).

However, higher education's decision to engage in distance education is not influenced as much by internal factors as it is motivated by external factors. Economic incentives and the culture of the information age are driving higher education to meet the demands of ever increasing student enrollments who want to engage in learning independent of space and time (Drucker, 2000). Just as higher education has a responsibility to respond to students' needs, it has an equal responsibility to respond to faculty who enable colleges and universities to meet the demands placed upon them by the economy and society (Gadieux and Swail, 1999).

Faculty Attitudes Toward Distance Education Training

Professional development programs for faculty should provide them with opportunities that will enable them to examine and discuss their attitudes toward distance education, adopt new pedagogies, and master the use of a variety of course delivery systems. However, faculty, like many other professionals, are faced with the challenge of having to meet their ongoing responsibilities while simultaneously learning new technological skills and attempting to integrate them into their professional roles. When viewed from this perspective, faculty can be regarded as adult learners and faculty development can be considered as an "adult learning undertaking." (Gillespie, 1998). Many of the adult student characteristics noted by Knowles (1984) and Brookfield (1984) may also be applied to faculty. Knowles (ibid) and Brookfield (ibid) hold that the majority of adult learners can learn from each other through the sharing of their rich experiences. Adults also develop attitudes and values based upon their previous knowledge, values and experience. Steinhart (1988) found that faculty based their decision of participation in distance education upon the knowledge and experience they or their colleagues had gained in this delivery mode and their philosophy toward teaching.

Knowles (1984) also found that adult learners expect that they will be able to readily apply what they have learned in the classroom to their professional or personal lives. Evidence of this purposeful learning was seen in faculty responses to a survey given to seventy faculty at four universities in Australia regarding their willingness to participate in distance education training. Faculty stated that they would only participate in training if it was relevant to their responsibilities in distance education and if they could apply what they had learned to their distance education teaching (Parer, Crocker &Shaw, 1988).

Knowles (1984) also noted that adults develop attitudes and values based upon their previous knowledge, values and experience. In a survey of one hundred and fifty faculty conducted at California Polytechnic Institute, Freberg, Floyd and Marr (1995) found that the presence or lack of knowledge and experience can have can have a great influence upon faculty's willingness to participate in distance education. Sixty-one percent of the faculty surveyed had no intention of teaching distance education courses. Their self-reported knowledge and experience of distance education varied from one extreme of being "extremely well informed" to "extremely uninformed." Overall the faculty who said they would be less likely to participate in distance education rated themselves as less informed about distance learning than faculty who said they would be willing to teach via distance education. The sixty-one percent of faculty who said that they would be less willing to teach distance education gave this response based upon their perception of distance learning as being impersonal, in comparison to a traditional classroom environment. Thus, the attitude and values that faculty hold, coupled with their prior classroom teaching experience influence their perceptions of distance education.

Brookfield (1986) held that adults will usually agree to participate in professional development activities if they are for a particular purpose and adults can readily apply the knowledge they have learned. This need for relevancy and immediate application of learning is reinforced by a group of interviews conducted by Parer, Croker and Shaw (1988) of seventy faculty at Deakin University, Gippsland Institute, South Australian College of Advanced Education at Massey. Faculty were interviewed about (1) the distance education policy at their institutions; (2) training given to faculty and staff that enable them to provide distance education; (3) the reward and career paths that were available to them as distance education providers and (4) whether they would participate in seminars and workshops on distance education if they were provided by their institution. Faculty responded that they would only attend training if it provided an opportunity for them to learn the skills that were relevant to those they would need to teach distance education and if they had time to attend.

Distance education training programs designed for faculty should likewise reflect andragogical characteristics cited previously (Knowles, 1984 and Brookfield, 1984). A climate should exist within faculty training programs that promotes a spirit of mutual respect, collaborative learning and mutual trust among faculty and the facilitator. Faculty's teaching experience and content knowledge should be recognized and faculty should be encouraged to work together so that eventually they might become distance education mentors to each other. Facilitators should be supportive of faculty as they learn new skills and encourage them to be open about concepts they may not grasp easily. Most of all faculty participating in such workshops should be involved in the planning these workshops, be able to identify what skills they want to learn and choose assignments and projects that will focus on their own courses (Harrison, et. al, 2000; McElhinney, J. & Bizhan, H., 1999).

One of the concerns that faculty have about distance education training programs is that once they receive training they will continue to have input in the design of their courses and interaction with their students. Many faculty avoid distance education as it can adopt the format of "cookie cutter courses" for, as Carnevale (2001) warns, "It's the standardization of on-line education that robs students of the diversity of knowledge that professors bring to the classroom." However, these same concerns present in a distance education environment are also present in large lecture halls where five hundred students are taught by a teaching assistant. Many universities have followed Cornell University's example in their quest to protect academic integrity in on-line courses. Cornell has addressed this dilemma through the creation of "E-Cornell," a for-profit university owned company that will administer on-line courses. This for-profit center will allow Cornell to raise the funds necessary to become a viable on-line provider of distance courses and simultaneously exercise quality control (Carr, 2000).

Intellectual Property Rights

In both for-profit and non-profit centers of distance education one of the greatest concerns among faculty is the reproduction of their intellectual property (syllabi, lectures, examinations, and other course materials) without their consent. In response to these concerns, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has required a reexamination of faculty intellectual property rights, the means by which institutions should protect these rights, and clarification of how faculty's intellectual property rights will be defined under the employment of third parties. (http://www.aaup.org/DistncEd.htm http://www.aaup.org/ stcopyrt.html, American Association of University Professors Statement on Copyright.)

As faculty's use of technology increases in both traditional classroom courses and distance education courses, faculty expect that colleges and universities will provide an environment that will not only support and reward efforts to engage in technology but will also protect their ownership of the work they create. If institutions fail to assure that individual intellectual property rights are protected, faculty will not have any incentive to participate in distance education or engage in creative efforts that involve technology (West, 1999; Harney, 1996; Burke, 1998).

However, faculty's intellectual property rights also need to apply to those collaborative works in which faculty engage with other faculty, technologists and designers. In addition, systems of interactive television, satellite television, or computer-based courses and programs are technically more complex and expensive than traditional classroom instruction, and require a greater investment of institutional resources and more collaborative efforts on the part of faculty and distance education course development experts (Gorman, 1998).

These issues of intellectual property rights not only make more difficult the question of who is entitled to claim ownership of materials designed for distance education; they also raise questions about the appropriate distribution of authority and responsibility between the general administration of the college or university and the separate academic departments or units within a given institution. The technical and administrative support units responsible for maintaining and operating the means of delivering distance education courses and programs are usually separate from particular academic departments or units which offer those courses and programs. (http://www.aaup.org/StDisEd.htm).

In response to these concerns, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) has recognized three types of copyrights that protect faculty's rights. The university shall own copyright only in the following three circumstances:

> I. The college or university expressly directs a faculty member to create a specified work, or the work is created as a specific requirement of employment or as an assigned institutional duty that may, for example, be included in a written job description or an employment agreement.

> II. The faculty author has voluntarily transferred the copyright, in whole or in part to the institution. Such transfer shall be in the form of a written document signed by the faculty author.
>
> III. The college or university has contributed to a "joint work" under the Copyright Act. The institution can exercise joint ownership under this clause when it has contributed specialized services and facilities to the production of the work that goes beyond what is traditionally provided to faculty members generally in the preparation of their course materials. Such arrangement is to be agreed to in writing, in advance, and in full conformance with other provisions of this agreement. (http://www.aaup.org/ipguide.htm, 2000).

AAUP's response to protection of faculty's intellectual property rights is prompted by an age when the advances in technology are expanding more quickly than institutions or legislatures can react to them. Therefore, in light of the conditions born within this age of expediency, AAUP recommends that universities institute an interim intellectual property committee composed of administrators and faculty that would represent the interests of both the administration and the faculty. This interim committee would serve a useful agent in both collective bargaining and non-collective bargaining environments and keep faculty and administration apprised of technological developments that may impact the contexts of distance education programs, legislation, and policy. The mission of such a committee would be to facilitate policy development and dispute resolutions. This interim committee should also serve as a forum where discussions can address existing policies, change to policies or provide recommendations for contract negotiations.

In addition to being a vehicle for discussion, the AAUP states that the committee should be given the authority in the following areas: "(1) to hear and render decisions about disputes over ownership, and its attendant rights, of intellectual property, (2) to determine whether the college or university or any other party has rights to the invention or other creation, and, if so, the basis and extent of those rights, (3) to determine or resolve competing faculty claims to ownership when the parties cannot reach an agreement independently of the committee, and (4) to review the merits of inventions, and other creations, and make recommendations for the management of the invention, including development, patenting, and exploitation. If the inventors/creators disagree with the committee's decision they may appeal to binding arbitration. The cost of the arbitration shall be borne equally by the university and the creator(s)." (http://www.aaup. org /ipguide.htm).

Factors that Motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education

Despite the expansive benefits of using technology, Wolcott, 1999, Betts, 1998, Clark, 1993, Olcott and Wright, 1995, Dillon and Walsh, 1992, Wagner, et. al, 1999; Smith, Eddy, Richards and Dixon, 2000 have noted an absence of institutional rewards for faculty to engage in technology and/or distance education training programs. Wolcott (1999) pilot tested a survey of forty-six faculty at forty-five Carnegie Category I (research) private and public institutions to examine three factors: (1) locus of motivation; (2) institutional values and commitment, and (3) return on investment. The thirty-three out of forty-six faculty members who responded included tenure track, research and clinical faculty who had taught or were teaching a distance education course at the university.

Wolcott's (1999) survey listed ten factors and asked faculty to indicate which of these factors had motivated them to participate in distance education. Respondents failed to reach a strong consensus that any of the items had influenced them to engage in distance education. Rather, the majority of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that (1) faculty want to earn more money (63%); (2) faculty who are teaching via distance education find it to be personally rewarding (57%); (3) faculty want to extend the reach of their programs. More respondents disagreed than agreed with the statements that the opportunities to use technologies (54%) and the opportunity to develop one's teaching skills (54%) motivate faculty to teach distance courses.

Wolcott's (1999) findings reveal a strong correlation between the commitment institutions were willing to make toward distance education and the degree to which the institutional mission embraced distance education. Forty-six percent of the faculty strongly agreed that there was a formidable relationship between their university's mission and distance education. Respondents reported moderate agreement regarding beliefs that: (1) their involvement in distance education is valued by their department chair (63%); (2) their department chair is supportive of their involvement in distance education (57%); (3) distance education is a top priority at their institution. Faculty took a neutral stand on the remaining twelve items that addressed institutional values and commitment toward distance education.

Taylor and White (1991) , Dillon, Hengst and Zoller, (1991); Johnson and Silvernail, (1990); Clark, Soliman, and Sungaila, (1985); Betts, (1998) found that most faculty are motivated by the following internal rewards to teach via distance education: (1) the ability to teach students who otherwise may not have access to education; (2) the opportunity to work with more motivated and serious minded students; (3) the flexible work schedule that distance education can provide; (4) the nature of distance education which requires more organization of materials and (5) the ability to use a variety of media resources.

Carr (2001) interviewed a faculty member at Columbia University about why he decided to work with an independent company to put his courses on line. The faculty member replied that his decision was influenced by the opportunity to reconfigure his course from introduction to completion, the ability to reach many more people than he normally would, the prospect of improving his "human capital" in regards to teaching and the chance to learn how to incorporate visual arts into his teaching. The faculty member also cited that teaching via distance education has allowed him to reflect more about his classroom teaching, how he presents material and what are the intended objectives of this material.

Aside from internal rewards, faculty attitudes are also influenced to a certain extent by external factors. Gilcher and Johnstone, (1989) discovered that faculty who were the most satisfied with their distance education roles were those who received support from faculty within their academic department who they deemed to be important. Stinehart (1988) found that faculty attitudes are also influenced by (1) awareness of distance education teaching; (2) perceptions regarding the use of technology in teaching; (3) experience they or their colleagues have had with technology and pedagogy; (4) the quality of materials they have had the opportunity to use in their distance teaching; (5)

the support they have received from their institution for their efforts in teaching and developing courses, and (6) the logistics of course delivery and the control they have had over the distance education courses they have taught.

Faculty attitudes are not only influenced by the degree of support they receive from their department chair, colleges and institution as a whole, but also by their personal philosophy toward teaching and any type of experience they have had with distance education. Steinhart (1988) found that faculty's decision of whether or not to participate in distance education was influenced by their knowledge of distance education, perceptions of the use of technology for teaching purposes, logistics, quality of materials, support they receive from the institution and the degree to which they are comfortable sharing the teaching process with distance education course development experts. Faculty who view distance education as a loss of their control over the learning process are less willing to teach via distance. When experienced distance faculty were interviewed, they described the use of technology with instruction as the second most significant predictor of their willingness to teach in a distance education program.

Steinhart's (1988) study also revealed that faculty are more likely to participate in distance education if they can teach their courses in a live setting rather than use pre-produced tele-courses. Faculty who were interviewed for his study were motivated by the input they were able to give in distance education courses rather than the out-put of their teaching (i.e., student learning outcomes).

A modified Delphi study of leading distance education policy analysts revealed several central components of distance education that are contrary to traditional academic assumptions about the teaching role of faculty. These values of distance education include: a dependence upon the assistance and coordination with instructional designers and technicians, and a shift of control in the learning process that places faculty in the position of having to address factors outside their discipline. This lack of control in the creation process of course materials gives faculty even less control over the intellectual property of these materials, which some perceive as a threat to their jobs (McNeil, 1990). This study also found that faculty had little control over which technology was chosen for their courses and how it was used. Thus, McNeil's (1990) study confirms that when faculty teach via distance education their roles do change.

Rewards for Participation in Distance Education

In response to Wolcott's (1999) questions which attempted to ascertain how faculty measured the return on their investment of deciding to teach distance education courses, faculty tended to be neutral in many of their responses, leaning toward the disagree response scale. The only exception to these neutral to negative responses was one question which addressed the equity of their rewards for teaching via distance education as compared to the rewards (if any) received by their colleagues. Forty-six percent of faculty surveyed said that they agreed that the rewards they received for teaching distance education courses were comparable to compensation other faculty received for the same type of work. Fifteen respondents strongly disagreed with the statement that their distance education teaching had earned them strong recognition from their department chairs, college or university. Given the small sample size of Wolcotts' survey, these findings may not be representative of the literature which perceives a lack of equitable rewards for faculty who engage in distance education

The majority of faculty who responded to Wolcott's (1999) survey strongly disagreed with the following statements: (1) their participation in distance education earns them credit toward improving their record of research and scholarship (69.7%); (2) compensation for teaching a distance education course is equitable (66.6%); (3) faculty receive equal credit for producing distance education materials (54.6%); (4) the rewards they receive in return for teaching distance education are proportionate to the amount of time and effort they put forth, (54.6%); (5) their efforts in distance education earn them informal merit (54%) and (6) their participation in distance education allows them to have a positive impact on their ability to receive tenure or promotion in professorship rank (51.1%). Wolcott's findings reinforce evidence of a lack of rewards in distance education (Gilcher and Johnstone, (1989).

Wolcott's (1999) findings also revealed a correlation between type of response and faculty's academic rank. Assistant professors strongly disagreed that the rewards they were receiving for involvement in distance education were equal to those their colleagues are receiving for classroom education. Assistant professors also disagreed more frequently than their fellow respondents that the rewards for distance education were equal to those rewards given for classroom teaching (67.6%) and equal with respect to the amount of time and energy invested (83.4%).

Associate professors, more often than assistant professors or full professors surveyed, disagreed more strongly that their efforts in distance education had a positive effect on their gaining tenure or advancement in rank. They strongly disagreed that their involvement in distance education earned them formal rewards or recognition (66.7%) or that it had a positive impact on them earning merit increases (55.6%). These two areas of distance education (lack of formal rewards and lack of merit increases) coupled with the lack of distance education's impact upon tenure and promotion generated more strongly held negative responses by assistant and associate professors. These two groups of faculty also strongly disagreed that their participation in distance education earned them more credit in improving their record of services and earning informal recognition.

When examining the land grant institutions that were included in Wolcott's (1999) survey, they provided evidence of engaging in alternative delivery methods and reaching students beyond the physical bounds of their campuses. Of all the universities surveyed, they all included distance education in their mission statements, but their commitment to distance education was not reinforced in their fiscal allocation for distance education programs. When evaluating faculty's performance, all institutions that participated in the survey rewarded faculty more highly for their research than for their distance or classroom teaching.

The differing levels of support and recognition of distance education faculty between the university and department levels led one faculty member included in Wolcott's (1999) survey to mention that the provost must recognize the value of distance education and reward faculty accordingly. Department chairs cannot run the risk of rewarding their faculty if the provost fails to see the value in this type of education. Thus, the attitude of the administration has a direct bearing on faculty teaching in distance education and this support allows departments to reward their faculty. Most distance learning programs utilize both full-time and part-time faculty in the delivery of their programs, as few distance learning programs have enough full-time faculty who can devote their entire teaching loads to distance education courses. Some institutions hire practioners to serve as distance learning mentors who are academically credentialed, but have very little distance learning experience. Although having practioners serve as course mentors or assistants is accepted, the credibility of the distance learning course still rests upon full-time faculty, even if there are small numbers of these faculty who choose to participate in distance education programs (Beaudoin, 1990). Thus, universities find ways in which to reward these faculty, as rewards will enable universities to not only recruit faculty to teach in distance education, but to retain them as well.

Faculty are also cognizant of the risk they may run by participating in distance education, as the time required for training and preparation of course materials may interfere with the time they can devote to research and publishing (Dillon and Walsh, 1992, Plater, 1995). One faculty member, whom Wolcott interviewed, emphasized that an article published in a peer-reviewed journal is a fairly well known commodity versus involvement in conducting an on-line course may be a risky activity, as it has not been included in criteria that directly impacts tenure and promotion.

Betts (1998) study conducted at the George Washington University also measured what factors motivated faculty to participate in distance education. Betts surveyed 8 deans and 993 faculty and received responses from 532 faculty and 7 deans. The instrument Betts used to survey faculty sought to measure the following factors: (1) demographic information about faculty; (2) their background in distance education (i.e., distance education courses taught, distance education courses taken, any training they may have received in distance education, etc.); (3) factors that would motivate faculty currently participating in distance education to continue teaching via distance and factors that would motivate faculty not participating in distance education to teach via distance education; (4) factors that would inhibit faculty currently participating in distance education and faculty not participating in distance education from teaching in distance education.

Faculty responses to Betts' questions regarding institutional policy toward distance education revealed the following findings: fifty-eight percent of faculty replied that they were not sure if a distance education policy existed at the George Washington University and sixty-seven percent of faculty responded that they were not sure if an unwritten, but operative policy existed at the George Washington University.

When faculty whom Betts (1998) surveyed were asked what the policy statement at George Washington University on distance education should contain, they made the following suggestions. (1) promise of technical, administrative and financial support (i.e., technical resources, funding and incentives to engage in distance education); (2) the assurance that quality courses would be produced and programs would be evaluated regularly (i.e., the University should encourage the development of quality programs); (3) opportunities to attend workshops, training and seminars provided by the University (i.e., demonstrations, hands-on learning, tutorials and collaboration with other faculty experienced and non-experienced in the field of distance education); (4) implementation of feasibility studies that would provide data that validated the advantages and disadvantages, cost benefits and benefits students received as a result of participating in distance education, (5) the option to participate or not participate in distance education (i.e., some disciplines are more suited to a distance education delivery than others) (Betts, 1998, p. 172).

Faculty interviewed by Betts were also asked whether they thought that distance education provided any career advancement advantages. Seventy-one percent of those interviewed replied that they were not sure if there were any advantages or disadvantages to participating in distance education. Over half of the respondents replied that if there were distinct advantages to participating, that these advantages would make a difference to them in their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education. Faculty were also asked if they thought they should be rewarded "differently" for teaching in a distance education environment. Over half of the faculty surveyed replied that they didn't believe that they should be rewarded any differently for their involvement in distance education (Betts, 1998).

The literature reveals that very few external rewards exist which serve as motivating factors for faculty to teach via distance education. Survey results from Wolcott (1999) and Betts (1998), both of whom conducted their research at Carnegie I classified institutions provided a means by which faculty could receive credit toward research or scholarship through their participation in distance education. Most faculty surveyed by Betts (1998) and Wolcott (1999) did not receive additional monetary compensation for developing or teaching distance education courses At best, the most external recognition faculty could hope to have achieved was recognition from a department chair for "carrying their academic load" for the department via distance education.

Distance Education as Teaching, Research or Service

Research continues to be valued more highly than distance education at research institutions and it is reflected in their faculty reward system. Higher education has yet to formally designate which category (teaching, research or service) distance education best serves. At present the literature presents arguments for applying distance education to all three categories (Betts, 1998; Wolcott, 1997 and 1999; Metzler, 1994; Schomberg and Farmer, 1994; Portman, 1978; Elman, 1994).

Wolcott (1999) did find that academic departments or colleges within the university valued distance education more than the upper levels of university administration because it provided a means by which academic units could reach their enrollment goals and therefore draw positive recognition in the eyes of the university. Ironically, even though distance education may enable a unit to meet its projected enrollments and serve as a conduit to university recognition, Wolcott did not find any written policies or procedures for faculty compensation, workload or reward for participation in distance education. Guidelines were rather vague in their reference to distance education's relationship to tenure and promotion.

In response to the changing demands placed upon faculty and the inadequacy of the current reward system to meet these demands, Metzler (1994) offers a new definition of scholarship that could be included in the criteria for faculty evaluation toward promotion and tenure. " A scholarship of engagement… wherein faculty actively use their considerable knowledge and expertise to assume a role as leaders for effecting change in society."

Metzer's (1994) emphasis on faculty applying their expertise to effect social change could be interpreted as including societal benefits that Stanford Forum (1995) describes as coming forth from the use of technology within higher education. These benefits include extending information to students beyond that which is available from a professor or the local library and making higher education available to students who otherwise would not have access to a college education. Thus, in Metzler's view, distance education could be placed within the category of service.

The results from Wolcott's (1999) survey reinforced Metzler's (1994) view of including distance education within the realm of service. The universities Wolcott (1999) included in her survey did not explicitly describe distance education as an activity for which faculty should receive credit, but they did not exclude distance education from consideration of reward. The wording of policies and procedures tended to imply that distance education could be considered as a form of "outreach." Thus, by virtue of increasing access, distance education could be included in this new realm of scholarship of affecting social change. Therefore a relationship could be drawn between faculty's efforts of engaging in service, under the auspices of distance education and their being considered for promotion and tenure.

Distance education also could be considered as "service" as it enables faculty to provide learning opportunities to students who normally would not have access to them. However, Wolcott (1999) notes that this mission of "service" is "the least weighted category" in terms of tenure and promotion and doubts if distance education will be placed in this category, unless the reward system is restructured to give service greater weight. Schomberg and Farmer (1994) remark that a means to measure faculty productivity as it relates to service is greatly needed in higher education. Service has not been heavily weighted in regard to promotion and tenure, and it is difficult for the academy to measure its outcomes as its involvement does not produce a measurable product.

Traditionally, research and publishing have been the criteria considered for promotion and tenure, as they are activities which produce measurable results (Thackwray, 1997; Mengis & Mathis, 1988; Karpol & Ginsburg, 1980; Meyer, 1998). Historically, the growth and development of land grant institutions fostered the idea that the higher education's mission to provide service was paramount to the continued development of a democratic society (Barber, 1992). The Wisconsin Idea is the best example of how the university directly ministered to public need through extension sites and involved faculty in state and municipal governments to improve their operations (Portman, 1978; Knowles, 1977; Brubacher & Rudy, 1968; Rudolph, 1990). It has only been in the latter half of the twentieth century that productivity within higher education has been measured in a such a linear fashion of research efforts. However, the advent of technology and distance education, and its impact on the faculty role, may provoke an internal change within higher education for productivity to be measured in different ways (Meyer, 1998).

Elman's (1994) definition of service provides a strong rationale for linking distance education's role of increasing access to a larger audience with the category of service, " Work that draws upon one's professional expertise and is an outgrowth of one's academic discipline. In fact, it is composed of teaching and research, but directed toward a different audience."

However, it is interesting to note that faculty from different academic disciplines who were included in Wolcott's survey (1999) also placed distance education within the areas of research and teaching. For example, disciplines such as engineering and business have difficulty in drawing a relationship between distance education and research in their academic content areas. Nursing faculty, on the contrary, may receive research or service credit for publications, grants and conference presentations that are generated as a result of their distance teaching. All universities which participated in Wolcott's survey counted faculty participation in distance education under the category of teaching, where it counts as part of the faculty's "teaching load."

The faculty whom Wolcott (1999) interviewed also perceived their participation in distance education as having a more positive effect at the micro-level of departmental politics. They described their participation as allowing them to "round out" their teaching portfolio, enabling them to gain some recognition among their peers, and gaining them the perception of being a team player in the eyes of their department chair. Although, Wolcott notes that the gains faculty thought they made at the department level were hardly noticed at the upper university administrative level.

Best Practices Cited by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP)

In response to the demands technology has placed upon faculty and the ways in which it has changed their roles and responsibilities, the AAUP has issued a set of "Best Practices." These are meant to be used as guidelines for colleges and universities that will create policies and procedures for their distance education programs.

(1) An appropriate distribution of authority between the college administration and academic departments should be clearly stipulated

(2) Standards for teaching and scholarship should be clearly defined. Special methods should be as designed for assigning, advising and evaluating students' work.

(3) Teachers' academic and legal rights must be clearly understood in regard to what syllabus, lectures, examinations and other course materials are accessible in an environment where they have no control over them.

(4) The institution should provide faculty with commensurate compensation for the additional time it takes faculty to interact with students and prepare to teach in this type of learning environment.

(5) New academic principles and procedures should be developed to apply to these new media of distance education so that they are in compliance with the institution's basic educational objectives.

(6) These new policies and procedures should include a definition of the responsibilities of each group involved in the development and delivery of distance education courses and services, especially in terms of each group's particular competence.

(7) Faculty should have primary responsibility in determining the institution's policies and practices in regard to distance education. The rules governing distance education should be determined by a vote of the faculty who are participating in the development and delivery of these courses, or of a representative body of the faculty, adopted by the appropriate authority and notification should be distributed to all interested and involved parties.

(8) Prior to advertisement or announcement, all distance education courses and programs should be reviewed and approved by faculty in the academic department where they will be housed, or by authorities who govern curricular matters.

(9) Faculty should determine the amount of credit a student may earn toward a degree through distance education courses.

(10) Faculty of the college or university should establish guidelines and procedures used for the granting of teaching load credit in the preparation and delivery of distance education courses.

(11) The institution must recognize that instructors must have release time from teaching in order to have adequate time to prepare materials for distance education courses and to become familiar with the technologies used to transmit these courses.

(12) Instructors assigned to teach distance education courses must be given support in the means of academic, clerical, and technical assistance, in addition to a means of communicating with students.

(13) The terms of instructors' appointments should be put in writing and be given to them before they are assigned to a distance education course.

(14) No faculty member should be required to participate in distance education courses without adequate training or prior faculty approval of the distance education course they are designated to teach.

(15) Instructors engaging in the delivery of distance education courses are entitled to academic freedom with the provisions of the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, jointly developed by AAUP and Association of American Colleges.

> (16) Instructors engaging in the delivery of distance education courses will have the same responsibility of selecting and presenting materials as they do in their traditional classroom courses.
>
> (17) The institution is responsible for the technical delivery of distance education courses. Faculty participating in the delivery of these courses are responsible for making certain that they have adequate technical skill required to teach these courses. In addition to their own skills, faculty should also have access to technical support. However, the burden of course content and presentation lies with the instructor.
>
> (18) The institution should create and post its policies and procedures that will protect its educational objectives and interests of those who create new material and those who adapt classroom material for courses given through a medium of distance education. These policies should include terms for compensating those parties who created new materials and adapted previously created materials, including any use or reuse of recorded material. Terms should also be included that allow instructors who created new material or adapted previously created material to exercise control over the future use and distribution of recorded instructional material and to determine whether material should be revised or withdrawn from use.

However, the AAUP's guidelines are only a theory of how the concerns surrounding intellectual property could be addressed. The policies and practices that address intellectual property rights vary greatly across the country. The University of Vermont, for example, divides the ownership of an on-line course between content which is designed by the faculty and instructional design which is owned by the institution's staff. Thus, the intellectual property of staff and faculty are both protected. If a professor left the institution, and the course was sold to another college, the faculty would continue to receive royalties and could decide if the content could be used at another institution (Carnevale, 2000). Burlington County Community College retains intellectual property rights for all of its on-line courses, which their educational technology specialist acknowledges may have deterred some faculty from designing and teaching on-line courses. The University of Missouri at Columbia has perhaps the most liberal policy which allows faculty to retain all intellectual property rights for any on-line courses they have created, even after they leave the University. A chairperson at the University of Missouri credits this policy for driving professors to design these types of courses (Carnevale and Young, 1999).

Duke University has proposed a policy that makes a clearer distinction between faculty's ownership of material created on their own time and that created under the auspice of "works for hire." This policy would allow faculty to retain ownership of all their distance education courses that they create as individuals, but the university would retain ownership of any courses created using Duke's resources or through work for hire arrangements. Faculty would be barred from teaching on-line courses at other institutions that compete with Duke's on-line or conventional courses. The university policy would also prevent a faculty member from teaching a course at an outside university that was designed in such a manner that it misled the public into thinking it was a Duke University course (Carnevale, 2000).

Other colleges have chosen to broker agreements between the institution and faculty that did not follow AAUP guidelines as closely as Duke University. Mott Community College allows faculty to own the intellectual property of a course, but the college retains ownership of the videotapes and the website where the course may be housed. At the University of Texas, faculty retain ownership of the course, unless an agreement has been made prior to the course design that faculty have been hired specifically to design a distance course, in which case the university retains ownership.

Future Recommendations from the Literature

Betts (1998); Kirby and Garrison (1998); Gunawardena (1990); Dillon (1989); McNeil (1990) and Dillon and Walsh (1992) reinforce the need for distance education programs to be more thoroughly integrated into the mission and objectives of academic departments or schools, specifically in regards to budgetary allocations and policies relating to tenure, promotion and merit. Kirby and Garrison (1998) found that distance education directors prefer that faculty not be compensated on the basis of overload because such a practice does not allow the faculty to have time for further training. Gunawardena (1990) offers the suggestion of providing academic departments with financial incentives for faculty who want to teach via distance education, as these incentives could breed acceptance of distance education among department chairs and faculty colleagues.

Summary:

The purpose of this literature review was to explain how the impact of technology and distance education has changed higher education. The historical development of extension sites and evening college programs, along with social changes have allowed learning to be integrated into the entire lifespan of learners, rather than being relegated to youth or adolescence. The Morrill Act of 1862 provided for grants of land for institutions of higher education to be established in each state and the Morill Act of 1890 provided for continued funds be appropriated for the maintenance and development of these land grant universities (Brubacher & Rudy, 1968).

As technology was gradually introduced to society through transportation (i.e., the railroad and car) and electronics (radio, television, vcr, and the internet) higher education has used these means as a way to make learning more accessible to students rather than expecting students to configure their lives in order to participate in higher education. The impact of technology upon higher education in the 19th and mid to late 20th century had little if any impact upon faculty roles, as faculty were not required to use technology in their classrooms. The only faculty who taught via technology (television or radio) were the ones who choose to explore these new forms of teaching. However, in the late twentieth century technology has been integrated into every facet of our lives and faculty are now expected to incorporate technology into their courses or to engage in distance education.

The use of technology brings with it expectations that faculty will experience change, in the distance classroom and by the copyright laws that govern the materials that they produce for learning in these new environments. As faculty roles change, so do their needs for support, training and rewards.

As technology has impacted faculty's roles and responsibilities, it has had an even larger impact on the culture and rewards system of higher education. The advent of the Internet has prompted an even greater access to faculty works, which provokes a need for preservation of faculty's intellectual property. In addition to the concern of intellectual property, higher education must address the larger issue of how distance education will be integrated into the faculty rewards system (tenure and promotion). Faculty site many internal motivators for participating in distance education, but in addition to personal incentives, they also need external rewards for engaging in this new median of education. The American Association of University Professors provides a comprehensive list of best practices regarding faculty rewards and compensation that universities can use as they create their distance education programs.

CHAPTER III

Chapter three describes the methods employed to conduct this study. Included are (1) an overview of the purpose of this study; (2) a description of the population and sample, (c) sampling methods that were used; (3) research questions; (4) instrumentation; (5) survey outlines; (6) explanations of how reliability and validity were achieved; (7) ethical considerations; (8) permission to use survey and make modifications; (9) data collection procedures and (10) prescription of data analysis employed in this study.

Overview

The purpose of this study is to determine what factors influence community college faculty in their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education. This study will examine the impact the following factors have upon community college faculty's motivation to participate in distance education: (1) demographic profile of classroom faculty, distance faculty and division chairs; (2) the extent to which classroom faculty, distance faculty and division chairs use technology to support their courses and to communicate with faculty, students and staff; (3) the length and degree of distance faculty's participation in distance education; (4) teaching via distance education, co-teaching via distance education and designing distance courses; (5) reasons cited by faculty for no longer teaching distance education or not wanting to teach distance education in the future; (6) The impact the absence of the research role has had upon faculty's decision of whether or not to participate in distance education; (7) the types of distance education delivery systems that are currently used; (8) percentage of faculty that did and did not receive distance education training; (9) years in which faculty received training; (10) where did faculty receive training; (11) delivery systems faculty were trained to use; (12) release time for distance education training ; (13) level of interest in training of those faculty who never received training; (14) Areas in which faculty would like to receive training; (15) distance faculty's rating of technical and administrative support and technical and pedagogical training; (16) all faculty and division chairs' preferred delivery mode – synchronous or a-synchronous; (17) faculty responsibility in designing and delivering distance courses; (18) distance faculty's, classroom faculty's and division chair's attitudes toward different rewards for faculty who participate in distance education; (19) faculty and division chair's attitudes toward rewards for faculty who participate in distance education training; (20) faculty and division chair's attitudes toward rewards for faculty who develop distance education courses; (21) the relationship between distance education and the mission of the community college; (22) factors that would motivate distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs to participate in distance education; (23) the impact that the faculty role changing from a knowledge provider to a facilitator has had upon faculty and division chairs' decision to participate in distance education; (24) factors that would inhibit distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs from participating in distance education; (25) distance faculty's, classroom faculty's and division chairs' attitudes toward distance education; (26) the number of distance faculty by campus and division who teach via distance education; (27) the number of faculty by campus and division who design courses that will be delivered via distance education; (28) the number of distance education courses offered by division at each of the five campuses within the community college.

Through interviews with the dean and associate dean of distance education this study also sought to determine (1) the administrative structure and responsibilities of the department of distance education; (2) factors which the dean and associate dean perceive as motivating faculty to participate in distance education; (3) the budget for the department of distance education and how funds are administered; (4) the characteristics which the dean and associate dean of distance learning perceive as being common in the faculty who participate in distance education; (5) the dean and associate dean of distance education address faculty criticisms of distance education; (6) the dean and associate dean's perceptions of faculty and division chairs' perceptions of distance education distance education training that is available for faculty at the community college; (7) distance training that is available for faculty at the community college; (8) intellectual property rights policies currently in place at the community college; (9) the dean and associate dean's perception of faculty rewards for participation in distance education; (10) the effect the community college mission has had upon the distance education program; (11) academic standards for classroom and distance courses; (12) current challenges and expectations of distance education.

Distance education continues to be a means of increasing the access of higher education to a wider audience and thereby increasing enrollments. Faculty are one of the key resources that make the delivery of distance education possible. However, in order to provide courses via distance mode delivery faculty must learn a new set of teaching skills which require more time and effort (Inman, Kerwin and Mayes, 1999; Gillespie, 1998).

Despite faculty's central role in developing and providing distance education courses, a survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education noted that faculty development in teaching distance education is not considered by universities to be crucial in the continued delivery of distance education as are other resources. A survey conducted by the US Department of Education in 1995 revealed that 25,730 distance education courses were offered in the fall of 1995. Of these institutions that offered distance education courses, three quarters of them relied upon faculty to develop these courses (http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs98/distance/98062-1.html). Despite the fact that an overwhelming majority of universities depended upon faculty to be the primary designers of these courses, only a quarter of these universities required faculty to have training in distance education. About 13% of these institutions required training in curriculum development, and 17% required training in teaching methods for distance education courses. When universities in this survey were asked to state their program goals for the next three years, 18% responded that they wanted to start or increase the number of distance education course they were teaching, to increase distance education enrollments, and to upgrade the technology they were currently using (http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs98/distance/98062-1.html).

Absent in the program goals of the colleges and universities included in this study was training for faculty who would teach these courses – a factor that would directly relate to increased course offerings and enrollments. Given the results of this survey, this study seeks to determine the degree of institutional support that currently exists for faculty teaching distance education courses at the community college.

However, in addition to institutional support for distance education faculty, extrinsic and intrinsic factors will also serve as motivators for them to become active participants in the distance learning environment. Clarke, 1993; Dillon and Walsh, 1992 underscore that faculty's willingness to participate in distance education comes from intrinsic motivation (i.e., the challenge of the experience and providing increasing access to education for students). Extrinsic factors include release time, monetary compensation, professional recognition of their distance education teaching accomplishments, the preservation of intellectual property rights, royalties on copyrighted materials, workload compensation and credit for distance education teaching toward tenure and promotion (Diamond & Adam, 1993; Vroom, 1964; Yuker, 1984; Wolcott and Haderlie, 1995).

Research conducted by Betts, 1998 and Wolcott, 1997 focuses upon faculty attitudes toward and awards for distance education at Carnegie I research institutions. Their findings support faculty's perception of a conflict between the academy's expectations that they conduct research and carry a full teaching load. The conflict between these roles arises due to the tri-part mission of the research institution – research, teaching and service, with a primary emphasis upon research (Diamond, 1993). On the contrary, the literature, at this point in time, lacks an in depth analysis of similar studies that have been done with community college faculty who teach via distance education. One may assume that since the community college does not expect its faculty to conduct research, that perhaps the absence of the research role would afford them more time to participate in distance education. The mission of the community college is "to develop a different type of curriculum, suited to the larger and ever changing civic, social, religious and vocational needs of the entire community where the college is located" (Boogie, 1950, in Cohen & Brawer, 1982). Of all the higher education institutions, community colleges represent the most compelling example of increasing access to postsecondary education to the public at large as their primary mission is teaching (Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

Fifty-two percent of faculty who teach at community colleges in the United States hold doctorates (National Center for Education Statistics (http:nces.ed.gov/quicktables /,1992). While their primary focus is upon teaching, and works within the literature place distance education within the realm of teaching, the literature fails to cite whether distance education is perceived as conflicting with classroom teaching or any other role the community college faculty may embrace. In addition to the literature's ambiguity toward how faculty gain credit for distance education, it also fails to address if faculty at community colleges have greater institutional support for their distance education activities, how they are rewarded for their distance education participation, and if institutional support or rewards have any impact upon the faculty's motivation to teach via distance education.

Presently, the literature has not clearly identified factors that motivate community college faculty to participate in distance education. The studies that have addressed faculty motivation and rewards for teaching in distance education (i.e., Betts, 1998 and Wolcott, 1997) were conducted at Carnegie Level I research institutions. These studies primarily addressed the level of conflict between faculty's participation in distance education and the academy's perceived lack of relevance to faculty's research responsibilities. The responsibility to conduct research is not inherent in the community college faculty role (Cohen and Brawer, 1972).

Faculty must not only learn how to use the technologies inherent in distance education; they must also be willing to change their orientation toward teaching from a teacher-centered to a learner-centered approach (Dillon and Walsh, 1992). However, before universities can begin to expect their faculty to change their attitude toward distance learning, universities must be willing to recognize the importance of faculty's role in the development of distance education. In a survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Education, faculty development in teaching distance education was not considered by universities to be crucial in the continued delivery of distance education as were other resources (http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs98/distance/98062-1.html).

Absent in all of the program goals of universities included in the U.S. Department of Education survey is a commitment to provide training for faculty and a clarification of how faculty who participated in distance education would receive credit toward promotion and tenure and how the academy award structure will respond to the changes in faculty roles and responsibilities. In addition to institutional support for distance education, faculty must also be provided with incentives that will motivate them to become active participants in this teaching environment. These rewards should include ownership in copyrighted materials, training in distance education and a clear understanding of how distance learning is valued within the faculty responsibilities of teaching, research and service (Plater, 1995; Olcott and Wright, 1995; Clarke, 1993).

Research Questions:

A. Demographic Profile of Classroom Faculty, Distance Faculty and Division Chairs

1. In what academic divisions do distance faculty teach?

2. What is the average age of distance faculty?

3. Do most distance faculty hold tenured positions, accruing tenured positions or contract positions?

4.How many years have classroom and distance faculty taught at the community college?

5. What is the gender of most distance faculty?

6. How does the course load of distance faculty who are teaching both distance and classroom courses differ from classroom faculty who only teach traditional classroom courses?

B. The Extent to which Classroom Faculty, Distance Faculty and Division Chairs use Technology to support their Courses and to Communicate with Faculty, Students and Staff.

1. What technologies do classroom and distance faculty and division chairs use to support distance education courses?

2.What technologies do classroom and distance faculty and division chairs use to communicate with students, faculty and staff?

3. Which group (classroom faculty, distance faculty or division chairs) has the highest usage rate of technology?

4. Which type of technology does each group use the most frequently?

C. The Length and Degree of Distance Faculty's Participation in Distance Education

1. What the average number of years which distance faculty and division chairs have been engaged in distance education?

D. Teaching via Distance Education, Co-Teaching via Distance Education and Designing Distance Courses

1. Have distance faculty, classroom faculty or division chairs been asked to teach a distance course?

2. Did they teach the distance course?

3. Have distance faculty, classroom faculty or division chairs been asked to co-teach a distance course?

4.Did they co-teach the distance course?

5. Have distance faculty, classroom faculty or division chairs been asked to design a distance course?

6. Did they design the distance course?

7. Would those faculty and division chairs who have not taught a distance course be interested in teaching a distance course in the future?

8. Would those faculty and division chairs who have not co-taught a distance course be interested in co-teaching a distance course in the future?

9. Would those faculty and division chairs who have not designed a distance course be interested in designing a distance course in the future?

E. Reasons Cited by Faculty for No Longer Teaching Distance Education or Not Wanting to Teach Distance Education in the Future

1. What factors inhibit faculty from wanting to participate in distance education?

2. Do faculty cite any reasons for not participating that are included on the researcher's list of inhibiting factors?

F. The impact that the absence of the Research Role at the Community College has had upon Faculty's Decision of Whether or Not to Participate in Distance Education

1. Given that the community college does not expect their faculty to conduct research, does the absence of this role provide them with more time in which they choose to participate in distance education?

G. The Types of Delivery Systems that Distance Faculty are Currently Using

1. What delivery systems are currently being by distance faculty?

H. Percentage of Faculty that did and did not receive Distance Education Training

1. What percentage of distance faculty did receive training?

2. What percentage of distance faculty did not receive training?

4. If faculty did not receive formal training, how did they learn how to deliver distance courses?

4. What percentage of distance faculty would be interested in receiving distance training in the future?

5. What conditions, if any did distance faculty cite for them to attend training?

6. What percentage of classroom faculty received distance education training?

I. Years in Which Faculty Received Training

1. How recently have distance faculty received their training?

J. Where did Distance Faculty Received Their Training?

1. Did the majority of distance faculty receive their training at corporations, proprietary schools or colleges and universities?

K. Delivery Systems that Faculty were Trained to Use

1. What delivery systems were faculty trained to use?

2. How do the delivery systems they were trained to use correspond to the delivery systems they are currently using?

L. Release Time for Distance Education Training

1. Of the faculty who received distance education training, did they receive release time for participating in this training?

M. Level of Interest in Training of Those Faculty who Never Received Training

1. What interest do classroom and distance faculty and division chairs who never received training have in receiving distance training?

2. What percentage of faculty and division chairs were not interested in seeking distance education training?

3. What reasons did classroom faculty cite for not wanting to participate in distance education training?

N. Areas in which Faculty would like to Receive Training

1. In which areas would classroom faculty be interested in receiving training?

2. In which areas would distance faculty be interested in receiving training?

3. In which areas would classroom faculty be interested in receiving training?

O. Distance Faculty's Rating of Technical and Administrative Support and Technical and Pedagogical Training

1. On a four point scale (ranging from very good to inadequate) how do distance faculty rate the technical and administrative support and the technical and pedagogical training that is available to them?

P. All Faculty's and Division Chairs' Preferred Mode of Delivery – Synchronous and A-synchronous

1.Do faculty and division chairs prefer synchronous, a-synchronous delivery or a combination of both?

2. Is there a difference amongst distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs as to which delivery mode they prefer?

3. How did the advantages and disadvantages of synchronous and a-synchronous delivery modes influence their preference?

Q. Faculty Responsibility in Design and Delivery of Distance Courses

1. Do distance faculty at the community college engage in a "systems approach" in their delivery of distance courses, a "combined approach" of consulting with other faculty or course designers or are they responsible for the design and delivery of their own courses? (A systems approach is defined as a team of experts (content experts, instructional designers, graphic designers, researchers and evaluators) who work together to provide a control mechanism that ensures that all component processes are well integrated and interact with each other" (Moore and Kearsley, 1996; Boston, 1992).

2. Would classroom faculty prefer to engage in a "systems approach" in their delivery of distance courses, engage in a "combined approach" of consulting with other faculty or course designers or are they responsible for the design and delivery of their own courses?

R. Distance Faculty's, Classroom Faculty's and Division Chair's Attitudes Toward Different Rewards for Faculty who Participate in Distance Education

1. Do distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs believe that faculty should be rewarded differently for their participation in distance education than they would be for participation in teaching traditional classroom courses?

S. Faculty and Division Chair's attitudes toward Rewards for Faculty who participate in Distance Education Training.

1. Do distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs think that distance faculty should receive release time, stipend, neither stipend or release time, either a stipend and release time or both a stipend and release time for their participation in distance education training?

T. Faculty and Division Chair's attitudes toward Rewards for Faculty who Develop Distance Education Courses.

1. Do distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs think that distance faculty should receive release time, stipend, neither stipend or release time, either a stipend and release time or both a stipend and release time for their participation in developing distance education courses?

U. The Relationship between Distance Education and the Mission of the Community College

1. How do distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs perceive distance education would best compliment the mission of the community college, under the categories of teaching, research, service, teaching, research and service, teaching and service, or teaching and research?

V. Factors that would motivate distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs to participate in distance education

1. To what extent would the following factors motivate distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs to participate in distance education?

Personal motivation to use technology
Reduced teaching load
Support from division chair
More flexible working conditions
Increase in salary
Strengthened job security
Receiving a stipend for distance education participation
College expectation that faculty participate
Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses
Visibility for jobs at other colleges and universities
Grants for materials and expenses
Support from departmental colleagues
Intellectual challenge of distance education
Technical, administrative and clerical support
Extent to which distance education would provide opportunities for career exploration and expansion
Credit toward promotion and tenure
Release time
Provision of distance training by the college
Merit pay
Royalties on copyrighted materials

Protection of intellectual property rights

Opportunity to diversfy program offerings

Recognition and rewards from the college

Ability to reach new audiences who can't attend campus based courses

Opportunity to improve classroom teaching through distance education participation

Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider to a facilitator

Opportunity to work with course designers, distance education instructors and technologists to develop and deliver distance courses

Creating support systems to retain distance faculty

Opportunity to teach a distance course in a "synchronous environment"

Opportunity to teach a distance course in an "a-synchronous environment"

W. The impact that the faculty role changing from a knowledge provider to a facilitator has had upon faculty and division chairs' decision to participate in distance education

1. How has the change in the role of knowledge provider to facilitator influenced distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs in their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education?

X. Factors that would inhibit distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs from participating in distance education

1. To what extent would the following factors inhibit distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs from participating in distance education?

Concern about faculty workload

Lack of distance training provided by the college

Lack of support from departmental colleagues

Lack of release time

Lack of professional prestige

Lack of technological background

Lack of support from division chair

Lack of grants or materials for expenses

Concern about the quality of courses

Lack of administrative, technical or clerical support

Lack of merit pay

Lack of royalties on copyrighted materials

Lack of monetary support (i.e. stipend)

Concern about quality of students

Lack of recognition or rewards

Lack of salary increase

Lack of credit toward promotion and tenure

A sense of loss of control over the teaching and learning process

A dislike for the collaborative nature of distance program design and delivery

Change in faculty role from a knowledge provider to a facilitator

Teaching a distance course in a "synchronous environment"

Teaching a distance course in an "a-synchronous environment"

Y. Distance faculty's, Classroom Faculty's and Division Chairs' Attitudes toward Distance Education

1. How do distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs perceive distance education, positively, negatively or neutrally?

Z. The Number of Distance Faculty by Campus and Division who Teach via Distance Education

1. How many faculty teach via distance education in each division and campus?

AA. The Number of Faculty by Campus and Division who Design Courses that will be Delivered via Distance Education

1. How many faculty in each division and campus design distance courses?

BB. The number of distance education courses offered by division at each of the five campuses within the community college.

1. How many distance courses are offered in each division and on each campus?

Research Questions for Interviews Conducted with the Dean and Associate Dean of the Department of Distance Education

A. The Administrative Structure and Responsibilities of the Department of Distance Education

1. What is the administrative structure of the Department of Distance Education?
2. What is the role of the Office in Distance Learning in assisting students and faculty?

B. The Budget for the Department of Distance Education

1. What percentage of the college budget is allocated to the Department of Distance Education?
2. How does the college arrive at the percentage of the budget that the Department of Distance Education receives?

C. Factors which the Dean and Associate Dean perceive as Motivating Faculty to Participate in Distance Education

1. What factors do the dean and associate dean perceive as motivating faculty to participate in distance education?

2. How do faculty's teaching styles influence their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education?

D. The Characteristics which the Dean and Associate Dean of Distance Education perceive as being common in the faculty who participate in distance education

1. Are faculty who are early, mid-way or late in their careers attracted to distance education?

2. Are these faculty looking for more of a challenge in their teaching environments?

E. The Dean and Associate Dean's Responses to Faculty Criticisms of Distance Education

1. What are some of the most frequent criticisms made toward distance education by faculty who have never taught distance courses?

2. How do the dean and associate dean address these criticisms?

3. How do the dean and associate dean address classroom faculty's fears that distance courses are drawing students away from campus courses?

F. The Dean and Associate Dean's Perceptions of Faculty and Division Chairs' Attitudes of Distance Education

1. What kind of relationship has the associate dean developed with the division chairs?

2. How do you work with the chairs to determine how many distance courses faculty will teach?

F. Distance Education Training and Faculty Responsibility for the Design and Delivery of their Courses

1. How does the College presently design and deliver its distance courses? Is there a team of course designers and technologists who assist faculty in this process, or are faculty solely responsible for the design and the delivery of their own courses?

2. What training opportunities are currently available for faculty who want to teach via distance education?

3. Are distance training sessions designed in convenient formats?

4. What opportunities are available for experienced faculty to mentor faculty who are just beginning to teach distance courses?

G. Intellectual Property Rights Currently in place at the Community College

1. What is the current intellectual property rights policy in place at the community college?

2. How do faculty and the college benefit from the current policy?

3. Under the current policy who owns the distance courses which are being delivered?

4. Does the current policy inhibit faculty from wanting to participate in distance education?

H. The Dean and Associate Dean's perception of Faculty Rewards for Participation in Distance Education

1. How do the dean and associate dean of distance education believe that distance faculty should be rewarded?

2. Do the dean and associate dean believe that faculty should be rewarded for teaching via distance education? Why? Why not?

3. Do the dean and associate dean believe that faculty should be rewarded for participating in distance education training? Why? Why not?

4. How do they address concerns about faculty workload in distance education?

5. How do they attract faculty to teach via distance education?

I. The Effect the Community College has had upon Distance Education

1. How do the dean and associate dean of distance education perceive the mission of distance education and that of the community college complimenting each other or conflicting with each other?

2. Do they perceive distance education as being well suited for traditional age students? Why? Why not?

3. How does the rolling admissions policy (allowing a student to begin a class at any point in the semester) impact distance education programs?

4. How does the policy of open enrollment (allowing any student with a high school diploma to enroll at the community college)?

J. Academic Standards for Classroom and Distance Courses

1. What are the current academic standards for distance and classroom courses? Who establishes these standards?

2. Are the same academic standards applied to distance and classroom courses?

I. Current Challenges and Expectations of Distance Education

1. What is the biggest challenge the dean and associate dean see facing the department of distance education in the immediate future?

2. How will the dean and associate dean face this challenge?

3. How do you see the department of distance education expanding in the future?

4. How do the dean and associate dean see the process by which courses are delivered and designed changing in the future?

The Pilot Study

The following components are addressed as they pertain to the pilot study: (1) a description of the population and sample for the pilot study; (2) sampling methods that were used for the pilot; (3) instrumentation used for the pilot study; (4) survey formats used for the pilot study; (5) data collection and procedures; (6) measures taken to assure reliability and validity; (7) ethical considerations; (8) data analysis employed.

A Description of the Population and Sample for the Pilot Study

The population for the pilot test included full-time faculty who were teaching distance and classroom courses during the 2001 spring semester at four community colleges located on the East coast of the United States.

The selected sample for this study included a random sample of full-time faculty who were teaching classroom and distance courses and division chairs from the following disciplines: business, math, science, social sciences, humanities, visual and performing arts, fine arts, technologies, physics, engineering, languages, literature, and scientific aviation parts. A total of 150 surveys were distributed to faculty and 17 surveys were distributed to division chairs.

Response Rate

Thirty-nine surveys were received from faculty via U.S. mail and one faculty survey was received via email. Five surveys from division chairs were received via U.S. Mail.

Sampling Procedures

The researcher contacted eleven community colleges that were located along the East coast of the United States. Of the eleven community colleges who were contacted, four elected to participate. Directors of distance education and institutional research at the four community colleges random sampled twenty-five to fifty faculty (who were either teaching classroom courses and distance education, or were solely teaching classroom courses) and purposefully sampled all of their colleges' division chairs.

Instrumentation

The survey of deans and division chairs was based upon a survey developed by Betts (1998). The first section of both surveys address demographic questions. Additional questions were included that focused upon faculty support, rewards, the changing role of the faculty member in distance education and how faculty and division chairs perceived distance education as relating to the community college mission. The topics these questions address were based upon salient topics within the literature and the distance education policies currently in place at the community college where the study was conducted.

Format for the Faculty Survey

The faculty survey consisted of a total of nine pages. Faculty were asked to complete eight of the nine pages. Approximate survey time completion was twenty minutes. The faculty survey was divided into the following sections:

Section I - Part A - Demographics

Section I, Part A contained fourteen questions that focused on faculty's demographic profile which included: (1) their academic division; (2) academic department; (3) gender; (4) age; (5) faculty rank; (6) campus where they are contracted to teach; (4) type of position they hold (contract or tenured); (5) the number of distance and classroom courses they teach per semester; (6) whether the distance courses they taught were delivered in a synchronous or a-synchronous mode; (7) the delivery systems they used to transmit their courses.

Section II - Distance Background

Section II was divided into two parts: Part B and Part C. Part B was designed for distance education participants and Part C was designed for non-distance education participants. Part B consisted of thirty-one questions and examined five areas: (1) faculty participation in distance education; (2) training and support faculty receive for teaching via distance education; (3) rewards faculty receive for teaching via distance education; (4) the change in the faculty's role inherent in distance education; (5) the relationship, if any, faculty perceive as existing between the community college and distance education.

Part B – Areas which this Survey Examined

(1) the number of years they have participated in distance education; (2) the nature of their involvement (i.e., design, delivery and or teaching); (3) delivery systems they have used; (4) if they are not currently participating in distance education, reasons for their non-participation; (5) how the protection of their institutional property rights influences their decision of whether or not to participate; (6) if the absence of the research responsibilities had afforded them more time to participate in distance education.

Part B - training and support faculty receive for teaching via distance education examined the following areas

(1) distance education training that faculty have received from the community college where they are currently teaching; (2) training that faculty would like to see be provided by the community college where they are currently teaching; (3) how faculty evaluate the administrative, clerical and technical support they are currently receiving for the distance education courses they are teaching.

Part B - rewards faculty receive for teaching via distance education examined the following areas

(1) faculty's perception of how well they are being rewarded for their participation in distance education, particularly for any collaborative efforts they engage in with other faculty; (2) faculty's perception of how they should be rewarded for their distance education participation, and if they should be rewarded differently than faculty who teach classroom courses; (3) faculty's perception of how, or if, their participation in distance education conflicts with other responsibilities they hold for which they receive professional rewards or recognition.

Part B the change in the faculty's role inherent in distance education examined the following areas

(1) How the changing role of distance education faculty from a "teacher-centered" to a "facilitator role in a learner-centered environment" has impacted faculty member's decision of whether or not to participate in distance education; (2) how the engagement in synchronous or a-synchronous teaching has impacted faculty's decision of whether or not to participate in distance education; (3) are faculty part of a "systems approach" or are

they solely responsible for the development and delivery of their own distance education courses; (4) if faculty are solely responsible for the development and delivery of their own courses, is this by faculty's choice, or by necessity due to the lack of institutional resources devoted to training and supplying a trained staff.

Part B - the relationship, if any, faculty perceive as existing between the community college and distance education examined the following areas

(1) Do faculty perceive distance education as serving the mission of the community college through research, community service or teaching; (2) in what other ways do they perceive distance education as contributing to the mission of the community college; (3) to what degree do they think their college is willing to commit their mission and budgetary resources to ensure that the distance education program at their community college will be a success.

Part C - Classroom Faculty interest in Participating in Distance Education

Part C was addressed to classroom faculty and consisted of the same areas and questions that were addressed in part B to distance education participants. However, Part C asked classroom faculty if they would be interested in participating in distance education and asked them to explain their responses.

Section D - Participants and Non-Participants – Motivating factors

Section D was composed of thirty questions and was directed at both participators and non-participators in distance education. Both groups of faculty were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree) the extent to which the thirty factors have motivated them or would motivate them to participate in distance education. Current and previous participants were asked to rate the same 30 factors on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree) the extent to which the thirty factors have motivated them to participate in distance education Non-participants were asked to rate the same 30 factors on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree) the extent to which the thirty factors would have motivated them to participate in distance education. Current participants were also asked to rate the same 30 factors on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree) on the extent to which the thirty factors would motivate them to continue to participate in distance education.

Section E: Current and Previous Distance Education Participants- Factors that Inhibit Participation

Section E was composed of twenty-two questions and was directed toward both participants and non-participants in distance education. Current and previous participants were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree) the extent to which the thirty factors have inhibited them from participating in distance education. Non-participants were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree) the extent to which the thirty factors would have inhibited them from participating in distance education

Section F: Current and Previous Participants and Non-Participants

Section F was composed of nine questions that centered upon faculty attitudes towards distance education in postsecondary education and focused upon the following factors: (1) faculty's perception about the community college's policy regarding faculty participation in distance education should be; (2) how the availability of distance education workshops would effect faculty participation; (3) what opportunities for distance education training and development faculty thought should be available; (4) how a reward system that specifically recognized and compensated faculty for their efforts in distance education would affect their willingness to participate in distance education.

Division Chair Survey

The division chair survey consisted of seven pages and the approximate survey time completion was twenty minutes. The survey consisted of the following sections:

Division Chair Section I: Part A: Demographics

Section I, Part A contained fourteen questions that focused on (1) Division chair's length of service at the community college; (2) their experience in distance education; (3) the type of training they had received; (4) their interest in receiving training or participating in distance education; (5) the level of faculty participation in distance education within their division.

Section B: Motivating factors

Section D was composed of thirty questions and asked division chairs to rank on a 5 point Likert scale (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree) the extent to which the thirty factors would motivate their faculty to participate in distance education.

Section C: Inhibiting Factors

Section E was composed of twenty-two questions and asked division chairs to rank on a 5 point Likert scale (1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree) the extent to which the thirty factors would inhibit their faculty from participating in distance education.

Section D: Attitudes toward Distance Education

Section D contained eleven questions that asked division chairs to share their opinions about the following issues in distance education: (1) their perception of distance education as applying to the areas of research, teaching or service; (2) how distance education related to the mission of the community college; (3) what the community college policy should be regarding rewards for distance teaching; (4) if faculty teaching via distance education should be rewarded differently; (5) if involvement in distance education influenced division chair's evaluation of these faculty; (6) how has the paradigm shift from knowledge provider to facilitator impacted their faculty's decision of whether or not to participate in distance education; (7) what measures could the community college employ to increase their faculty's participation in distance education; (8) what measure could the community college implement to retain its faculty who are teaching via distance education; (9) to what degree did division chairs think that their community college was willing to commit their mission and budgetary resources in order to make their distance program more successful.

Data Collection and Procedures

The directors of distance education and institutional research served as the researcher's contact points to the institution. The researcher provided these individuals with copies of the instrument and they distributed them to their faculty, who could return them to the researcher by email or by using the self- addressed envelope she had provided.

Validity and Reliability

The validity and reliability of Betts' (1998) survey has been strengthened by its use at Baylor University, Navy Postgraduate School, Temple, Texas A&M, University at Houston - Clearwater, University of Iowa and University of Arkansas at Little Rock. The survey which the researcher used in the pilot study was adapted from Betts' instrument and was again revised after the completion of a pilot study. The final instrument used in the primary data collection was pilot tested again at a community college with a group of ten community college faculty. Cronbach alphas were calculated to determine validity and reliability and they produced a range of scores of .85 and above, confirming a high level of validity and reliability.

Ethical Considerations

The community colleges and faculty who participated in the pilot study were guaranteed complete anonymity and the completion of the survey was completely voluntary. A letter accompanied the survey that explained the purpose of the survey and the value their participation added to the data collection. Faculty and division chairs were instructed not to include their names, social security numbers or the name of their college on the survey. The researcher included her phone number and email in the cover letter so if they could contact her with any questions. There were no risks or side effects to completing this survey.

Data Analysis

Responses to closed ended questions which could be numerically coded were analyzed through SPSS. Responses generated from open-ended questions were coded by using a list of categories that were drawn from the literature.

Rationale for Survey Revisions

Upon receipt of the completed pilot test survey, the researcher reviewed faculty and chairs' responses to questions in order to determine patterns in their replies. Based upon these patterns she elected to eliminate any questions which elicited similar responses. For example, most faculty provided the same response to question 21 in section B, "Should your community college reward faculty differently for involvement in distance education than for traditional teaching and research? If yes, how should they be rewarded? If not, then why shouldn't they be rewarded differently?" as they did to question 30 "What do you think the community college's policy should be on rewarding faculty for teaching distance education?"

Classroom faculty when responding to section C gave the same responses to questions 12 "What do you think the community college's policy should be on rewarding faculty for teaching distance education?" and question 14 "Should your community college reward faculty differently for involvement in distance education than for traditional teaching research? If yes, how should they be rewarded, if not then why shouldn't they be rewarded differently?" Thus, questions 21 and 30 from section B and 12 and 14 from section C were condensed into one question that all faculty were asked to answer, "Should your community college reward faculty differently for involvement in distance education than for traditional teaching and research? If yes, how should they be rewarded? If not, then why shouldn't they be rewarded differently?" Likewise the vast majority of distance faculty provided the same responses to questions in section D, factors that have motivated them to participate in distance education, as they did to questions in section E, factors that might motivate them to continue their participation. Therefore, section E was eliminated from the final survey.

Questions in the pilot survey which were open ended and were answered in levels of degrees (i.e., excellent, fair, good, etc.) were reconstructed to provide faculty with a choice of different degrees of answers. For example, question number 17, 18 and 19 which ask faculty to describe the levels of administrative, clerical and technical support were condensed to question 18 "If you are currently teaching distance courses please mark the box that best describes the quality of support you are receiving, very good, good, fair or inadequate.

Questions in the test pilot which were intended only for distance faculty were rephrased so that all faculty could respond to these questions, thus making for a much richer data collection. Question 1, in section B for distance faculty under the heading "Participation" , "How many years have you been involved in distance education" was rephrased to address all faculty " Please place a check next to the box at the right that best corresponds to your non-participation or participation in distance education" and an additional answer of "never participated" was added Question 14, of section B for distance faculty, under the heading "Training support", "Have you received formal distance instruction" was directed toward all faculty in the final survey.

The following questions which did not directly measure factors that motivated or inhibited faculty's decision to participate in distance education at the community college where they are presently employed were deleted from the survey and question 11 under demographics "How many distance education courses do you teach at other institutions during each semester?"; questions 3, 4 and 5, section B, under the heading "Participation" which asked how many distance education courses during their professional careers faculty had taught, co-taught, or designed." Any form of technology that was listed in Betts (1998) original survey which faculty did not stipulate as using in the pilot was eliminated from the final survey, i.e., audio-tapes, and radio.

Pilot Test Results

Demographics

Academic Departments

The majority of classroom and distance faculty were from the same academic departments, humanities and social science. Four division chairs were from the arts and sciences and one division chair was from business and technology.

Community Colleges That Participated in the Pilot Study

The representation of classroom and distance faculty reflected similar distributions: seven distance faculty and seven classroom faculty were from community college D, five classroom faculty and seven distance faculty were from community college B, three classroom faculty and five distance faculty were from community college A and three classroom faculty and two distance faculty were from community college C. Three division chairs were from community college D, one chair was from community college A and one chair was from the community college B.

Age of Faculty and Division Chairs

There was also a similar distribution in age of faculty with twelve distance faculty and fifteen classroom faculty being over the age of forty-five. All division chairs replied that they were over forty-five years of age.

Appointment Status: Tenure vs. Contract

The proportion of classroom and distance faculty appointment status almost mirrored each other in terms of numbered tenured (nine distance faculty and eight classroom faculty), tenured accruing (one distance faculty and one classroom faculty), and contract faculty (eight distance faculty and eleven classroom faculty). Forty-seven percent of the distance faculty (nine faculty) were tenured and forty-two percent of the distance faculty (eight faculty) held contract positions. The percentage of contract and tenured classroom faculty was almost evenly distributed, thirty-eight percent of classroom faculty (eight faculty) were tenured and fifty–two percent (eleven faculty) held contract positions.

Years Employed at the Community College

The mean number of years having taught at the community college where they are now working was almost the same for both classroom and distance faculty, thirteen years for distance faculty and fifteen years for classroom faculty. The five division chairs reflected a wide range from less than a year to thirty-one years.

Class Load

The mean number of classroom courses taught by classroom faculty was 4.7 , the mean number of classroom courses taught each semester by distance faculty was 4.42 and the mean number of distance education courses taught each semester by distance faculty was 2.42. Thus, distance faculty had a heavier course load than classroom faculty.

Rewards

Overall, classroom faculty, distance faculty and division chairs were evenly divided over the question of whether faculty should be rewarded differently for their participation in distance education. Forty–four percent of the total sample, consisting of chairs and faculty (twenty people) indicated that faculty should be rewarded differently while the same number reported that distance faculty should receive the same rewards as classroom faculty. The researcher compared classroom and distance faculty responses to this question and found a contrast in their responses. Sixty-three percent of distance faculty (twelve faculty) agreed that distance faculty should be rewarded differently, twenty-six percent of distance faculty (five faculty) disagreed with their colleagues and felt that distance faculty did not deserve any different rewards. Thirty-eight percent of classroom faculty (eight faculty) responded that distance faculty should be rewarded differently while forty-seven percent of classroom faculty (ten percent) felt that distance education faculty should not be rewarded any differently for their distance education pursuits.

When classroom faculty were asked how rewards or the lack thereof had impacted their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education eleven faculty (or fifty percent) replied that it had no effect. Three faculty also noted other factors that they deemed to be more important than rewards, the quality of the students who participate, lack of adequate facilities and a concern that faculty would have to teach more students via distance education than they would in a regular classroom setting. Three faculty stated that faculty should only be rewarded for the time they devote to developing a course. Four faculty's remarks focused upon faculty's workload and made the following recommendation: (1) a standard workload should be determined for all distance courses; (2) faculty should be given a reduced course load in light of the time that distance classes require; (3) a site of eight people should equal one class; (4) one distance course should equal one fourth of a regular class or the professor should receive monetary compensation.

Distance education faculty perceived a "different kind of reward" to translate to mean more money, equitable rewards, release time and adjustment to their teaching loads. Their comments included, "A stipend should be given for extra time and effort," " More money, more time, fewer courses," "Compensation and/or release time for additional time/effort it takes to teach and develop courses. Pay and reward should be commensurate with the time it takes," " I don't know about rewarding differently, I do know that release time is needed for development," "Web courses constantly need updating and revisions. Particularly true when a textbook changes. Should get additional teaching credit for these courses," "Limit class size," "Rewards need to be equitable, but there needs to be research into the comparable workload of distance vs. traditional," and "I need to see documentation to justify more compensation. I teach almost double sized traditional classes without extra compensation."

Division chairs all agreed that faculty engaged in distance education should not receive special rewards, with the exception of one faculty member who added that faculty should be rewarded for the first course they design. Their comments are as follows, "Faculty should be rewarded for their initial course – because of the required learning of skills," "Only changed methodology. No special rewards other than training." Another division chair, who had not received training, nor had taught a distance course made this comment, "From my experience, distance learning is much less demanding." When division chairs were asked how faculty's involvement in distance education impacted their annual performance evaluation of faculty, their responses were mixed, two division chairs replied that it had a positive influence on their evaluation, two chairs said that it didn't have any influence on their evaluation and one said it had minimal influence. However, one chair noted, "We need an evaluation process to determine effectiveness of distance learning courses."

Faculty Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction to Current Rewards for Participation in Distance Education

Distance faculty's reaction to the question, "Are you as a distance faculty member satisfied with your current rewards" was divided. Six distance faculty were satisfied with their rewards as is described by two faculty members, "My overall compensation is good. The flexibility in teaching distance education is the real advantage for me" and "My satisfaction comes mainly from the success/failure of my students. I'm still seeing how that goes. But I do feel this is an important alternative for some folks who can't attend at regular times, so I feel I'm making a valuable contribution here."

Six faculty were dissatisfied, as is seen in these comments from faculty "Totally dissatisfied," "Not satisfied. Administration expects distance faculty to teach better, be held more accountable and held to a higher standard than faculty who teach traditionally," "Fine at first when I was given release time to develop courses, but I am unhappy now that new platform is being used and I need to be retrained without any release time," "The College rewards us poorly in terms of acknowledgement. Actually, the College is more likely to praise techno teachers than others," "Lousy, what rewards!" and "We should get more teaching credits for each course."

Use of Technology

Classroom faculty responses revealed a higher usage rate of technology in supporting courses with cable television (twenty-four percent or five faculty) videotapes (Forty-two percent or nine faculty), two-way computer conferencing (ten percent or two faculty) and CD ROMS (Sixty-one percent or thirteen faculty), but they had a lower usage of the internet than did distance faculty. The vast majority of comments from classroom faculty revealed that they perceived technology as a tool that could enhance course material, but it was not a good means by which to interact with students, as some faculty noted "nothing can take the place of face to face contact."

Distance faculty reported equal usage of cable television (thirty-one percent or six faculty), two-way computer conferencing (5.3% or 1 faculty). Their responses reflected less usage of cd roms (thirty-six percent, or 7 faculty) and videotapes (10.5 percent or two faculty). The only technology which distance faculty represented a higher percentage of use was the internet (84% or sixteen faculty) compared to classroom faculty who revealed that only (52% or eleven faculty) of their population used it as a means of communication. Division chairs revealed the lowest usage of technology with only one chair stating that he or she used blackboard as a means of supporting courses and communicating with students, administrators or other faculty.

Distance Education Training Sought

Forty-three percent of classroom faculty (nine faculty) responded affirmatively that they would like to receive training in distance education, twenty-four percent (five faculty) indicated that they were not interested in training and twenty-four percent (three faculty) said that that they might consider distance education training. Classroom faculty comments about whether or not they would participate in training included " If I have time available I will participate," "It would depend upon the type of training that is being offered. I am only interested in video conferencing," "Training is available and I do participate," and "I have attended training sessions and I don't want to teach this way." Classroom faculty voiced interest in receiving training in the following areas: course development, instructional design, changed teaching expectations, technological details, presentation training and how to teach in a learner-centered environment. They also stressed that there should be many opportunities available for training and that those faculty who are interested in teaching via distance education should be supported and encouraged.

Reasons classroom faculty gave for not engaging in training included: "The discipline of science doesn't transfer well to distance learning," "Community college students are too immature," "Community college students wouldn't like distance education because they would become too frustrated with the technology," "Faculty lack technical skills, they prefer the face to face contact and there isn't enough support or compensation."

Distance faculty were divided over the question of whether they would like to receive training in distance education. Seven distance faculty replied that they would like to receive further training, six replied that they might consider seeking further training and three said they were not interested. When asked the areas in which they would like to receive training, distance faculty replied one-way audio conferencing, two-way audio conferencing, two-way on-line computer conferencing, audio-graphics, audiotapes, cable

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

television, the internet, video tapes, pedagogy class management, video-streaming and one way audio visual conferencing.

Division chairs responses' to areas in which they would like to receive training were not as extensive as those of distance faculty, but they included two-way on-line computer conferencing, cable television and the internet.

Distance Education Training Received

Fifty-seven percent of distance faculty (eleven faculty) indicated that they received training prior to teaching their first distance class, but forty-two percent of distance faculty (eight faculty) indicated that they had not received training prior to teaching their first distance education class. Of this forty-two percent of faculty who had not received training, eight percent said that they didn't receive training, but relied on written materials and were self-taught. Of the eight percent who didn't initially receive training, only twenty-five percent (two faculty) said they eventually received training, while the other seventy-five percent (six faculty) said they never engaged in training. Distance faculty who did engage in training received it at the community college where they presently teach, or at a college where they previously taught. Thirty-one percent of distance faculty (six faculty) received their first training as early as 2000, while twenty-six percent of faculty (five faculty) received it in 1999. The types of distance education training that faculty cited they most frequently participated in were web/blackboard (twenty-one percent or four faculty), web CT (thirty-one percent or six faculty) and two way audiovisual (10.5 percent or two faculty). Of the sixty-three percent of faculty (twelve faculty) who answered the question "did you receive release time for training?", five faculty said they did receive release time, while seven faculty said they did not.

Only two division chairs indicated that they had received distance training in multi-site television, video and blackboard at their current community college and at the college where they worked just prior to the position they now hold. These division chairs received their training in 2000 and 1992.

Participation in Distance Education

Chairs' responses to the question, "How many distance education courses are offered through your division?" were equally divided. Two chairs responded that their division offers between eleven and nineteen courses and two responded that they only offer between one and five courses, while the fifth division chair said that his division offered six to ten courses. Chairs' answers to the questions "How many faculty in your division teach or design distance education courses" revealed a range from four to ten faculty who were engaged in these activities. Only two chairs indicated that they had taught and designed distance education courses. These same chairs also replied that they were interested in teaching , co-teaching or designing distance education courses in the future.

Classroom faculty were evenly divided over whether or not they would participate and what incentives would have to be provided in order for them to engage in distance education. When classroom faculty were asked if they would be interested in participating in distance education in the future, six replied that they would interested in teaching, co-teaching or designing distance courses, five indicated that they might consider such involvement and ten said they were not interested.

The reasons classroom faculty cited for not participating in distance education included being uncomfortable with the format, lack of support, training and release time, being unclear as to how they would be compensated for participation and the belief that distance education or the current software available doesn't work well within their discipline. One faculty also cited "If I engaged in distance education, students at the distant site would feel left out of the class." Another faculty member expressed concern that she couldn't retain control at the site where she was not present and one faculty member noted that the demand for his on-campuses courses is so high that he doesn't see a need to teach via distance education. Classroom faculty responses to the question "Would you consider teaching distance education in the future?" were relatively positive. One faculty member is currently transferring parts of her class over to distance education, another is seeking training in putting parts of her class on video, and others welcome distance education as a change from classroom teaching. When classroom faculty were asked if they had an interest in designing courses, most said they would rather teach than design. One faculty expressed concern that traditional age community college students are too immature for distance education and another faculty member said that she has to have substantial control in her classroom and distance education would not afford her that control.

Seventy-one percent of classroom faculty (fifteen faculty) reported that they had never been asked to teach a distance education course. Only one faculty member responded that he or she had been asked to co-teach a distance course. A slightly higher number of five classroom faculty said that they had been asked to design a distance education course and eight faculty responded that they had contemplated teaching, co-teaching or designing a distance course. Classroom faculty responded in the same manner to the question, "Would your willingness to engage in distance education depend upon release time, a stipend or both." Six classroom faculty responded that both incentives of release time and a stipend would be necessary if they were to participate, five faculty indicated that release time would be sufficient and ten indicated that neither incentive would motivate them to participate.

The majority of distance faculty (32% or six faculty) indicated that they had participated in distance education for one year. Twenty-one percent of faculty (four faculty) indicated that they had participated in distance education for four years. Almost half of distance education faculty who were surveyed (forty-seven percent or nine faculty) replied that their involvement in distance education had consisted of teaching and designing distance courses. Three distance faculty noted that they had taught via distance education and had ceased doing so for the following reasons "I taught as an adjunct, then someone else took over the course," " I never got to know my students and felt that distance education was low quality," and "Students were abusive (demanded immediate feedback), the workload was too heavy and I had infrequent access to the internet."

Motivating Factors for Distance Faculty

Distance faculty were given a list of thirty factors which they were asked to rate on a five point Likert (1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree and 5 strongly agree) the extent to which these factors would influence faculty to increase or continue their participation in distance education and the extent to which these factors currently motivate them to participate in distance education. The researcher calculated the means of responses in descending order. There was very little difference between the means of the thirty factors, with the exception of the eleven noted in Table one.

Table 1

Low and High Means of Distance Faculty Responses to the Question of Which Factors Motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education and to Continue to Participate in Distance Education

Factors that currently motivate faculty and would motivate them to continue to participate.	**The Mean for "Currently Motivates Faculty to Participate"**	**The Mean for "Would motivate faculty to continue participation."**
Support Systems to Retain Distance Education Faculty	1.74 (represents an opinion of disagree)	2.11 (represents an opinion of disagree)
Protection of Intellectual Property Rights	1.95 (represents an opinion of disagree)	2.63 (represents an opinion of disagree)
Faculty receiving royalties on copyrighted material	1.58 (represents an opinion of disagree)	2.63 (represents an opinion of disagree)
Merit Pay	1.53 (represents an opinion of disagree)	2.68 (represents an opinion of disagree)
Granting Release time	1.79 (represents an opinion of disagree)	2.95 (represents an opinion of disagree)
Technical, administrative and clerical support	1.79 (represents an opinion of disagree)	2.79 (represents an opinion of disagree leaning toward neutral)
Intellectual Challenge of teaching distance education	3.58 (represents an opinion of neutral leaning toward agree)	2.89 (represents an opinion of disagree leaning toward neutral)

Table 1 Cont.

Low and High Means of Distance Faculty Responses to the Question of Which Factors Motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education and to Continue to Participate in Distance Education – Cont.

Factors that currently motivate faculty and would motivate them to continue to participate.	**The Mean for "Currently Motivates Faculty to Participate"**	**The Mean for "Would motivate faculty to continue participation."**
Receipt of Grants for material expenses	1.74 (represents an opinion of disagree)	2.37 (represents an opinion of disagree)
Monetary support for participation (credit for overload, stipend, etc.)	1.95 (represents an opinion of disagree)	3.58 (represents an opinion of neutral)
Reduced Teaching Load	1.53 (represents an opinion of disagree)	2.68 (represents an opinion of disagree)
Increase in Salary	1.47 (represents an opinion of disagree)	3.37 (represents an opinion of neutral)

Motivating Factors for Classroom Faculty

Classroom faculty were also given the identical list of thirty factors which they were asked to rate on a five point Likert (1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree and 5 strongly agree) the extent to which these factors would motivate them to participate in distance education. Ninety percent of the means calculated from the responses of classroom faculty revealed that classroom faculty were neutral toward the motivating factors they were asked to rank. The three means listed in Table 2 represent those responses which deviated from this pattern.

Table 2

Low and High Means of Classroom Faculty Responses to the Question of Which Factors Would Motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education

Motivating Factors	Means for the Responses
The Extent to which clerical, technical and administrative support would motivate them to participate in distance education	4.05 (represents an opinion of agree)
The Extent to which release time would motivate them to participate in distance education.	4.14 (represents an opinion of agree)
The Extent to which distance education training provided by the college would motivate them to participate in distance education	4.05 (represents an opinion of agree)

Factors Division Chairs Think Would Motivate Their Faculty to Participate in Distance Education

The means of fifty three percent of the responses (sixteen responses) from division chairs revealed that they were neutral toward the motivating factors. The means listed in Table 3 denote responses where chairs agreed or disagreed with the extent they perceived these factors would motivate their faculty to participate in distance education. The higher the mean indicates that respondents agreed that the factor influenced their decision and the lower the mean, the respondents disagreed that the factor had any influence on their decision.

Table 3

Low and High Means of Division Chairs Responses to the Question of Which Factors Would Motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education

Motivating Factors	**The Means of Chairs Responses of the degree to which these factors would motivate faculty.**
The Extent to division chairs perceive personal motivation to use technology would influence their faculty to engage in distance education.	4.80 (represents an opinion of agree)
The Extent to division chairs perceive support or encouragement from a division chair would influence their faculty to engage in distance education.	4.20 (represents an opinion of agree)
The Extent to division chairs perceive more flexible working conditions would influence their faculty to engage in distance education.	3.80 (represents an opinion of neutral leaning toward agree)
The Extent to division chairs perceive monetary support for participation (i.e., overload, stipend, etc.) would influence their faculty to engage in distance education.	3.80 (represents an opinion of neutral leaning toward agree)
The Extent to which division chairs perceive the opportunity to develop new ideas for courses would influence their faculty to engage in distance education.	4.20 (represents an opinion of agree)
The Extent to which division chairs perceive support and encouragement from departmental colleagues would influence their faculty to engage in distance education.	3.75 (represents an opinion of agree)
The Extent to which division chairs perceive the intellectual challenge would influence faculty to engage in distance education.	4.20 (represents an opinion of agree)
The Extent to which division chairs perceive faculty would be motivated to participate in distance education if they received distance education training provided by the college.	4.0 (represents an opinion of agree)
The Extent that division chairs perceive faculty receiving royalties on copyrighted material would influence them to engage in distance education.	2.20 (represents an opinion of agree)

Table 3 - cont.

Low and High Means of Division Chairs Responses to the Question of Which Factors Would Motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education

Motivating Factors	**The Means of Chairs Responses of the degree to which these factors would motivate faculty.**
The Extent that division chairs perceive faculty would be motivated to participate in distance education as it would provide them with an opportunity to diversity program offerings.	4.20 (represents an opinion of agree)
The Extent that division chairs perceive faculty would be motivated to participate in distance education as it affords them an opportunity to improve their teaching.	4.20 (represents an opinion of agree)
The extent to which division chairs perceive the change in faculty role from a knowledge provider to a facilitator would influence faculty to participate in distance education.	3.80 (represents an opinion of neutral leaning toward agree)
The extent to which division chairs perceive the opportunity for faculty to teach in a "synchronous context" would motivate faculty to participate in distance education.	2.20 (represents an opinion of disagree)

Comparison of Chairs' and Faculty Responses to Motivating Factors

The researcher calculated the means of faculty and chairs' responses to which factors would motivate faculty to participate in distance education. The higher the means, the higher the level of agreement that the factor heavily influenced respondents and the lower the mean, the stronger the disagreement that the factor had any influence on respondents' decisions. Faculty and division chairs reached approximate agreement on most motivators with the exception of the ten factors noted in Table four.

Table 4

Motivating Factors about which Classroom and Distance Faculty and Division Chairs disagreed on the degree that they would motivate them to participate in Distance Education

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Division Chair Faculty	Personal Motivation to use technology	4.80 3.62
Division Chair Faculty	Reduced Teaching Load	3.80 2.64
Division Chair Faculty	Support from division chair	4.20 3.49
Division Chair Faculty	Monetary support for participation	3.80 2.97
Division Chair Faculty	Grants for material expenses	3.60 2.62
Division Chair Faculty	Training Provided by the College	4.0 3.13
Division Chair Faculty	Merit Pay	3.60 2.44
Division Chair Faculty	Change to facilitator role	3.80 2.44
Division Chair Faculty	Work with course design professionals	3.60 2.74
Division Chair Faculty	Support systems for retention of DE faculty	3.60 2.69

Comparison of Distance and Classroom faculty's Responses to Motivating Factors

The researcher also calculated the means of distance and classroom faculty's responses to which factors would motivate faculty to participate in distance education. The higher the mean indicates that the respondents were in agreement as to the degree of the factor's influence on their decision. The lower the mean indicates that the respondents disagreed that the factor had any influence on their decision. Distance and classroom faculty reached approximate agreement on most motivators with the exception of the sixteen factors noted in Table five.

Table 5

Motivating Factors about which Classroom and Distance Faculty disagreed on the degree that they would motivate them to participate in Distance Education.

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Reduced Teaching Load	1.53 3.52
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Flexible Working Conditions	3.21 4.0
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Increase in Salary	1.47 3.33
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Strengthened Job Security	2.42 3.43
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Monetary Support for Participation	1.95 3.76
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Grants for Materials and Expenses	1.74 3.29
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Technical, Administrative and Clerical Support	1.79 4.05
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Credit for Promotion and Tenure	2.05 3.05
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Release time	1.79 4.14
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Training Provided by the College	1.95 4.05
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Merit Pay	1.53 3.14
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Royalties on Copyrighted Material	1.58 3.33
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Protection of Intellectual Property Rights	1.95 3.52
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Rewards and Recognition from the College	2.37 3.52
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Opportunity to work with DE course design professionals	1.68 3.57
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Support Systems to Retain Distance Faculty	1.74 3.43

Factors that Classroom Faculty Perceive as Motivating Faculty to Increase Faculty Participation

Classroom faculty cited the following factors might increase faculty participation in distance education: "Include faculty in the evaluation process and recognize them for their contributions," "Continue to clarify compensation," "Screen students for participation in distance education," "Secure quality distance professors," "Make sure that courses run 'on-load'," "Provide mentors for novices," "Publicize distance education successes," and "Demonstrate that students need this particular method of teaching."

Division chairs felt that faculty's participation in distance education could be increased by providing technical support, equipment, recognition for their accomplishments and making distance education one of their responsibilities from their point of hire. Only one chair mentioned that faculty should receive monetary compensation for distance education. Their comments reflect these ideas, " I think there is a great interest now and it continues to grow," "Provide assistance, acknowledge and reward by honoring providing assessment and evaluation criteria that is enforced," "Hire with the expectation that they will be involved, "Increase in resources in all areas: Greater internal consulting ability for design, more funds for hardware, and software, greater support for development," and "Pay more per course."

Ways Community College can Motivate Faculty to Participate in Distance Education

When classroom faculty were asked what their community college could do to motivate them to participate in distance education and retain distance faculty they replied, "Explain how distance education relates to the learning process and mission of the community college," "Provide strong training programs and technical support services," "Determine who owns the materials," "Pay for course development," "Understand the time demands of distance education," "Reduce my course load," and "Give me release time, and clerical support to help develop courses, reduce course load for two semesters of a new course and team teaching for initial year."

Distance faculty responded to this question with the following suggestions, "Provide support" (five faculty), "Provide training and exposure to distance education" (eight faculty), "Release time" (seven faculty), "Monetary compensation" (six faculty), "Adjust teaching loads" (three faculty), "Provide stable technology" (three faculty), "Create a change in administrative philosophy and admit that distance education isn't for every faculty member and student" (three faculty) and "Screen students, limit the number of students in each class and admit that distance education is more work for the faculty member." When distance faculty were asked to assess the level of technical, administrative and clerical support they currently receive, they replied, "Excellent" (three faculty), "good" (four faculty), "Adequate" (two faculty), "Minimal" (five faculty), "Mediocre" and "Inadequate" (four faculty). Some of them commented on the level of support, "No support for tele-courses, but some support for web-courses," "the support is good, but the technical support is stressed," "Great support for television, for future on-line courses, it's adequate, but we will need more support staff," and "Release time is needed for additional training."

Inhibitors for Distance Faculty

Distance faculty disagreed that all the factors listed as "inhibitors" interfered with their motivation to participate in distance education. The lowest means which represent responses closest to the category of "strongly disagree" and the highest mean, which represent the response closest to "strongly agree" are listed in Table six.

Table 6

Inhibiting Factors which Distance Faculty Disagreed had any Influence on Their Willingness to Participate in Distance Education

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Distance Faculty	Concern about Faculty Workload	2.74
Distance Faculty	Teaching in an "A-Synchronous" Environment	1.42
Distance Faculty	Teaching in a "Synchronous" Environment	1.42

Inhibiting Factors for Classroom Faculty

Means determined from classroom faculty's responses revealed that they were neutral toward the majority of factors that were characterized as being inhibitors toward distance education. However, their responses indicate that they agreed that faculty workload, lack of release time and lack of clerical and administrative support could be considered as inhibitors. They disagreed that the collaborative nature of distance education, the change in faculty role to facilitator, and having to teach in synchronous as well as a-synchronous environments were inhibitors. One classroom faculty member expressed concern over privacy and cheating "Anyone can cheat and I can't look at students. Our society desperately needs human contact although some people prefer not to develop social skills." The lowest means which represent responses closest to the category of "strongly disagree" and the highest mean, which represent the response closest to "agree" are listed in Table seven.

Table 7

Inhibiting Factors which Classroom Faculty Would or Would not Inhibit their Decision to Participate in Distance Education.

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Classroom faculty	Concern about faculty workload	4.05
Classroom faculty	Lack of release time	3.81
Classroom faculty	Lack of technical, administrative and clerical support	3.86
Classroom faculty	Dislike for collaborative nature of distance education	2.52
Classroom faculty	Change of faculty role to a facilitator	1.76
Classroom faculty	Teaching in an "a-synchronous" environment	2.38
Classroom faculty	Teaching in a "synchronous" environment	2.48

Comparison of Classroom and Distance Faculty for Inhibiting Factors

Means of classroom and distance faculty were similar on the four responses listed in Table 8, and the fifth factor reveals the only stark disparity between the two samples.

Table 8

A Comparison of Classroom and Distance Faculty's Responses as to Which Inhibitors would Influence their Decision to Participate in Distance Education

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Teaching in a "synchronous"environment	1.42 2.48
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Lack of professional prestige	2.05 2.86
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Lack of recognition and rewards	2.05 2.86
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	The change in role from a knowledge provider to a facilitator	1.53 1.76
Distance Faculty Classroom Faculty	Concern about faculty workload	2.74 4.05

Means of Division Chairs for Inhibiting Factors

The means calculated from the responses of division chairs represent neutral responses to the majority of factors, with the exception that they disagreed that lack of grants inhibited faculty's involvement in distance education. They also showed moderate agreement on the issue of release time and workload as being problematic. Table 9 displays the means of responses which reflect the extremes of the Likert scale of disagree or agree.

Table 9

A List of Inhibitors which Division Chairs Either Agreed or Disagreed would Influence their Decision to Participate in Distance Education

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Division Chair	Lack of grants for materials and expenses	2.60
Division Chair	Concern about faculty workload	3.80
Division Chair	Lack of release time	4.0

Comparison of Faculty and Division Chair Responses to Inhibitors

The means of faculty and division chair responses were very close in proximity. These means only differed along four factors: release time, lack of monetary support, changing role of faculty and faculty teaching in a "synchronous" environment. This is displayed in Table ten.

Table 10

A Comparison of Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses as to which Inhibitors would influence their decision to Participate in Distance Education

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Division Chair Faculty	Lack of release time	4.10 3.15
Division Chair Faculty	Lack of monetary support for participation	3.60 3.03
Division Chair Faculty	Changing faculty role from knowledge provider to learning facilitator	3.80 1.69
Division Chair Faculty	Teaching in a "synchronous" environment	3.0 2.03

Responses to Open Ended Questions

The Community College Mission and Distance Education

The perception of how distance education relates to the mission of the community college was divided between service and teaching. Thirteen classroom faculty thought it rested solely in the mission of teaching, eight distance education faculty agreed with their classroom colleagues who thought it was most attributable to teaching. Division chairs and the remainder of classroom and distance faculty were equally divided between service and teaching.

Attitudes Toward Distance Education

Overall, attitudes held by faculty and division chairs were positive toward distance education. Eleven distance faculty, four division chairs and five classroom faculty described their attitude toward distance education as positive. Eleven responses from faculty and chairs were neutral and only seven responses were negative.

Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Attitudes toward what They Believe the Distance Education Policy should be at Their Community College Regarding Faculty Participation in Distance Education

Classroom faculty's responses to this question focused primarily on fair compensation for distance faculty and how faculty should be selected for participation in distance education. Eight classroom faculty voiced that participation in distance education should be strictly voluntary. Classroom faculty were asked what they believed community college policy should be regarding distance education and here are their responses: "Rewards should come from internal satisfaction," "Release time should be given for course development," "Faculty pay should be equivalent for the time spent developing the course," "Once a faculty member has been trained to deliver a distance education course, the course should run regardless of the number of registered students," "Limits should be placed on the number of students who can register for a distance course," "Distance faculty should receive more pay," (two faculty) and "Distance courses should be part of a faculty's load."

Distance faculty's responses to this question were very similar to the answers they gave about how the college should reward them for their engagement in distance education. Distance faculty thought that the college should allow them to have more release time for preparation, stipends for course development, and allow them to adjust their teaching loads. Their comments support these suggestions, "Faculty who teach distance learning should be awarded a stipend for their participation. We now have a person in charge of distance learning who reports to one of the provosts. There is a schedule of training and support in place", and "Reasonable class size, preparation time, property rights. For some faculty, distance learning is a convenient solution (time/distance issues are relevant for some of us too). The ability for those who prefer this methodology to have a more flexible schedule, to not have to show up every day – that I suppose is an advantage. I don't know that everyone should teach this way. I'd like to see some real self-selection, both in terms of faculty and students, deciding who should do this and what reasons/conditions make it work."

All five division chairs agreed that distance faculty should not receive special rewards for engaging in distance education, only one chair supported the idea of special rewards for the development of their first course. Their comments are as follows: "No rewards. Part of teaching load," " Faculty should be rewarded for their initial course – because of the required learning of skills," "Only changed methodology. No special rewards other than training," "Part and parcel of faculty activity that is recognized in annual evaluation. If there is an institutional imperative to improve this (or any other) area, additional incentives could be used," " Should not reward."

Change in Faculty Role from Knowledge Provider to Learning Facilitator

Thirteen classroom faculty were very vocal in stating their belief that the assumed change from knowledge provider to learning facilitator in a distance environment did not have any impact in their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education. They conveyed that such an assumption erroneously creates the perception that distance education is the only environment that is learner-centered. The majority of classroom faculty claim that they are facilitators in their classroom teaching. Many faculty complained that distance education makes it very difficult to interact with students and review course concepts. One faculty member noted that she is trying to make her class more learner-centered and another faculty member confessed that it is more challenging and requires more skill to be a facilitator rather than a knowledge provider, and this is one reason she doesn't teach via distance education.

Distance faculty's responses were very similar to those of their classroom counterparts. They all stated that they were learning facilitators prior to becoming distance education faculty and that learning-centered environments are not limited to distance education settings. They were not motivated to participate in distance education by any change in their teaching role. Their comments included, "I use a learning-centered environment for all of my classes," " I disagree that one demands a change in philosophy, though the medium can inspire change, comparable learning goals and environment can be shared," and "Not a change. The traditional classroom has evolved well beyond the lecture. Good traditional instructors have been creating a learner-centered environment for years!"

Division chairs offered a wide range of responses when asked if a change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider to learning facilitator would affect their faculty's willingness to engage in distance education. Many felt that becoming a facilitator required a change of teaching style that some faculty were unlikely to undertake, while two chairs assumed that their faculty had already made this change in their instruction. Chairs also noted that faculty may be reluctant to learn the technology that is necessary to deliver distance courses. Division chairs' responses varied greatly from their faculty's, who for the most part, characterized themselves as always being facilitators. Comments from division chairs reflect concern about their faculty's unwillingness to change their teaching style, "I do not think this has impacted their decision. I think the digital divide is the deciding factor," " I believe that this is a major obstacle," " Two-thirds of faculty are reluctant, but this is a critical change that must be made in all methodologies," "Relying more on past experience (because I have been at this current institution only a short time) I would say that the paradigm shift has been going on for many years. If it affects decision values I would say mostly positively – philosophically compatible," "Many faculty in the humanities are reluctant to abandon the classroom. "

Faculty Preference of Teaching in a "Synchronous" or "A-Synchronous" Environment

Six classroom faculty expressed a preference to teach in an "a-synchronous" environment. Seven classroom faculty preferred teaching in a "synchronous" environment and cited the following reasons for wanting to teach in this mode: "Synchronous provides more interaction with students otherwise I would hand out study sheets and my email address," " I can't stand to sit at a computer all day, if I preferred a job like this I would take one and not teach," and "I prefer synchronous, but it isn't workable for the student."

Seven distance faculty preferred to teach in an "a-synchronous", while only four favored synchronous learning environment. Those preferring an "a-synchronous " environment said. "I strongly prefer a-synchronous. The main purpose of distance learning is to provide flexibility for students who need it. I would not consider teaching a synchronous distance learning course," "A-synchronous! It's why most students are choosing distance learning so it is easier to implement."

The four classroom faculty who favored synchronous environments cited the immediacy of feedback and spontaneity of give and take , " I like the synergy of a group of students working on a project together. That's more fun for me," and " Synchronous and face to face. Distance education takes the fun part of the job and leaves the tedium," and "I prefer synchronous, as in an a-synchronous environment it means that I am just a facilitator." Some distance faculty found both environments to be conducive to learning and noted how their strengths compliment each other, " Each has its benefits. I prefer the spontaneity , the 'ah-has!' factor of learning synchronously. I prefer the a-synchronous learning to encourage more thoughtful reflection on a topic. However, all learning is a-synchronous, even if it's in a classroom."

Course Delivery: Systems Approach or Individual Work

Six classroom faculty indicated that they preferred a systems approach to distance education as they lacked the necessary expertise to develop a course by themselves. Those classroom faculty who selected the solo approach did so as their college does not have a team of course designers and technologists who assist faculty in the development of distance courses. Two faculty indicated that they would like a combination of collaborative and solo efforts, and would like to link their web-pages to those at other colleges that they believe address their discipline particularly well (i.e., Fordham University's history department).

There were only six distance faculty who responded to this open ended question out of the nineteen distance faculty who completed the survey. Five of the six who responded indicated that they have to design and deliver their own courses, due to the size of their departments or the lack of support at the college. Their comments are as follows, "This is not a multi-section course. I did receive materials from another professor who had designed some materials before, which was helpful to me. But as I am teaching the only section, it was pretty much left up to me to develop it," "I am only one of two teaching in my discipline and "I am solely responsible for development and delivery of DE course because it is the only option available to me," "I AM the philosophy department here I also prefer to work on my own" and "Lack of support forces me to work with little outside help. It's trial and error mostly." One faculty member notes that she uses a bit of the systems approach and also works on her own, "A bit of both; collaborative on how to delivery; individual as to course content as we are a very small place and I am the only person teaching anthropology and human geology, my main course load.

Ways in which Distance Education would Compliment the Community College Mission

Classroom faculty's replies to this question focused upon the ability of distance education to widen the access of education to a greater number of people and provide a greater number of courses. Classroom faculty's remarks are as follows. Four faculty believed that distance education serves adult students who are working full-time and attending school part-time and another faculty said that distance education is a good way to mentor younger students. Two faculty mentioned that by offering on-line courses from other institutions the college could offer a greater variety of courses and four faculty stated that distance education makes learning available anywhere and any place. One faculty member replied that it is the community college's mission to utilize all methods to serve the community.

Distance faculty agreed with their classroom colleagues to the extent that they perceive distance education as broadening the access to higher education for working adults who otherwise could not earn a college degree. Their comments support this philosophy, "I don't think that distance learning needs to be singled out. What it does is to allow the college to serve students in a more flexible way allowing those with child care, job responsibilities, physical handicaps the ability to take courses without the restrictions of time and place," "Many of my students couldn't possibly take my courses on campus. We can serve them. Let's do it," " I think this provides an important option to students who cannot pursue the traditional time/location-based education" and "We could be more flexible in start and end of courses, rather than a straight semester approach." Only one faculty member was critical in the role distance education provides, this faculty referred to it as "Strictly revenue raising."

A Lack of Coherence between Distance Education and the Community College

Only eleven classroom faculty replied to this question and their remarks were quite divided. Six classroom faculty simply stated that there wasn't any lack of coherence and didn't elaborate on their remarks. To the contrary five classroom faculty explained how distance education was inappropriate for a portion of their student population. Their remarks are as follows: "Distance education is not appropriate for traditional students at community colleges," "Distance education is appropriate for students with discipline, direction and motivation – these are not community college students," "Distance education is presented as being realistic for most students, this isn't so, it serves a small albeit important part of our population," "Many community college students aren't independent learners. Community college students need personal contact. These students who lack independent learning characteristics are our core population," "New insecure students may give up without person to person contact," and "Mixed messages are being given to staff, administrators and faculty. If done properly distance education is an asset to the college."

None of the distance faculty who responded to this question perceived a lack of coherence between the community college and distance education. One faculty member pointed out how adult students differ from traditional age students and explained how distance education can meet their needs as adult learners, "Part of college should be interaction with others, group work, making friends and contacts. I also believe faculty have an important role to play through personal contact with students. Not everyone needs this, particularly adult students returning to brush up specific skills. But for many, that aspect of education can be missed entirely in a strictly DL environment."

Community College's Commitment to Distance Education via Its Mission and Fiscal Resources

Seven classroom faculty stated that their colleges are willing to commitment to distance education. Their comments included, "(Willing to commit) quite a bit – we have a new distance education director," "College is committed to increasing options for student learning any place, any time is the new focus," " I think the college has made a significant commitment," "I hope our community college is committed to the best ways of serving the community, taking into account cost and success," "I think they have already given a lot of support, facilities and training."

Eight classroom faculty voiced concerns about limited budgetary support for distance education. Their remarks included the following: "Money is available for technology, but little money is available for the "soft end", the less easily defined and evaluated. You have to be willing to risk," " The College wants to be able to commit, but I am not sure that it can. Supporting distance education shouldn't undermine other facets of the college, most of which are more central to its mission of the community college. Distance education can be provided by any institution. We're a community college – central to our existence is the classes we have to offer," "The College is committed to a limited degree, particularly due to our tightening budget next year," "Our college is committed but funding and support is not," "I don't feel as though there is any commitment or money," "The college is very willing, able is another issue," and "I don't know where budgets are concerned, I would say caution is the best descriptor."

Distance education faculty were somewhat pessimistic about the degree to which their college was willing and able to monetarily support their mission of distance education. One faculty member provides a synopsis of the situation at his community college: "1) I think the college is genuinely focused on this methodology, if nothing else, because of space constraints for live classes. And I believe there is a commitment to this option as part of our mission of providing alternatives for students.

2) I think more attention needs to be paid to the methods for helping those students who are not well suited for this kind of learning – what can/should we do for them besides sink or swim? 3) Also, the reality is that this technology will change so much in the next ten years that our current conception of DL will be radically altered. The whole paradigm of text-based synchronous, DL is going to go out the window with changes in the

technology. I'm really interested in what DL will be like when I can see the students, look at all their screens, respond live to their questions – in a DL computer- based environment. That's a ways off, and it's hard to plan for it when the technology is not here (affordably yet). But it is coming and we need to think about it. And we need to not focus too much on what we're doing now, since it really is temporary."

Other faculty's comments included a focus on priorities and how they are reflected in the college's budget, " Very small, they want to increase distance offerings but will not commit resources easily," " Highly supportive, but wise enough not to over commit when the success of distance learning is being established," " Ongoing effort with the focus on the classroom," " 360 degrees that is. It will not commit its mission at all. Budgets would be made to support this mission. We spend lots of money on many machines, little on people. We grow budgets, there but not employees," " Very low commitment on money! Relying on mandates and threats to gain faculty participation", "Not very committed. My college's willingness is tied to increasing student enrollment at the lowest possible cost and increasing faculty support and rewards is contrary to this bottom line thinking."

Division chairs' comments about their College's ability to commit the budget and mission to distance education were less pessimistic than were those of distance faculty. Some admitted that their College supports distance education while balancing with other priorities, but most were confident that their College could meet the needs of all its students. Their comments are as follows. "I believe that the stars are all aligned – a perfect time for my college. Funds, resources and personnel have been finally awarded with the administration's blessings," "College supports but only as alternative to not as the core way of doing business," "Within budgetary constraints and multiple needs in the college system this institutional is not badly committed" and "A significant degree. The success of any educational enterprise should be based upon what students learn."

In What Ways might Intellectual Property Rights Influence your decision of whether or not to participate in Distance Education?

Eight classroom faculty responded to this question by saying that intellectual property rights had no effect upon their decision of whether or not they would participate in distance education. Conversely, only four distance education faculty made the same reply. One classroom faculty member wasn't aware of how intellectual property rights impact distance education ("Intellectual property rights are probably covered under distance education."), another classroom faculty voiced concern ("Intellectual property rights greatly affect me, otherwise I'd quit"), and the last classroom faculty member was aware of the College's policy " The college has an intellectual property right policy that covers us"). Others viewed the lack of intellectual property rights protection as affecting their course content and providing a rationale for their salaries to be increased, "It wouldn't affect my decision to participate in distance education, but it would affect my content," "I wouldn't mind people outside the college using my material, but I wouldn't want anyone inside the college using my material," "Lack of a clear policy would deter me from participating in distance education," and "I would want more money if my materials were college property."

Six distance faculty members responded that "If my intellectual property rights weren't protected I'd quit." An additional six distance faculty stately strongly with exclamation points after their statement "My rights would be violated!")

Absence of the Research Role and Its Effect on Faculty Participation in Distance Education

Nine distance faculty responded that the absence of this role has no effect upon them and seven distance faculty reported that the absence of a research role affords them more time for teaching. One distance faculty member commented on how the lack of required research has impacted her, "It allows time to freely pursue research and course development as I direct," and two faculty argued that community college faculty are required to do research, "There is a research role, my naïve graduate student!" and "Community college faculty are expected to assess outcomes and publish results. That's research and it's a myth that community college faculty are exempt from this."

Distance Faculty's Perception of Rewards for Distance Education

Six distance faculty replied that they are not rewarded in any way for teaching via distance education. Their comments on the College's lack of rewards include, "Distance education is not rewarded in any way," "No rewards, no influence," "On-line courses are clearly promoted as instructional goals by the administration," "There are no rewards, therefore little or no collaboration," "No rewards are given. Administration has noted it expects collaboration, but there's no strategy it supports for seeing that it happens," and "So far my distance education courses have counted as part of my required course load . However, low enrollment is paid by the student and does not allow for planning time (which is about the same for large enrollments) after the first run of the course."

Responses from four distance faculty indicated that they perceived their rewards as being more of an internal nature " I don't have much feedback on this yet. I hope that I will be given priority to continue to teach the class that I have developed - I would really hate to have put in that much time to develop it and not get to teach it again next year. I think that is part of the administration's plan," "I could care less about your rewards!" "Poor at best, not really acknowledged, but obviously not a factor for me." Another faculty was pleased with his rewards from his department, " Rewards are good. I teach in distance education because I enjoy the challenge and the computer technology" while another faculty sounded quite hostile, "Poorly rewarded; participation mandated; mandate angers me."

Retaining Distance Faculty

Five distance faculty responded that the faculty should increase support for faculty who choose to engage in distance learning. They had the following suggestions, "Engage in internal marketing to increase awareness of possibilities for training (technical and pedagogical) and offer differential payment or reduced load," "Accommodation for the additional effort involved. Services available need to be improved," and "More money, more time, more support and better equipment. Also a change in the corporate culture and appreciation of faculty efforts." Seven distance faculty said that more money would aid in retention and made these comments, "Pay more money or release time" "Investigate workload and equitable pay," and "Pay more for the design and grant more load for teaching."

Two distance faculty voiced a need for more training opportunities "Continue training updates as necessary", five distance faculty replied that they needed more release time "Reduce the number of days of campus for distance faculty. Allow adequate release time for developing courses, including professional development activities," one distance faculty suggested that "college should hire more faculty just to teach distance courses," and another replied, "Size of distance classes should be limited."

When division chairs were asked what they could do to increase the retention of distance faculty, they failed to see how this population of faculty differed from any other faculty in their need to be appreciated and supported in their work. "They (the College administration) continue to offer professional development opportunities and have now created a position for a director of distance learning who will continue to see that the needs of faculty, staff, and students are met," "Maintain quality program with appropriate support services such as advising and an active help desk and tutoring," " So far, retention issues seem to be no different for this group than for faculty at large," "Appreciation – words and deeds. No real difference from appreciating good work no matter what type," and "Don't know."

Ways in which Faculty's Time Spent on Distance Education Might Conflict with any other Responsibilities that could offer Them more Professional Rewards or Recognition

Most distance faculty responded to this question by focusing on their frustration on the amount of time they spend answering questions that are not academically related. Their comments include: "The development and grading for this course (creating on-line quizzes, downloading files, responding to students who can't figure out how to log-in or who fail to follow the written directions) is very time consuming. I anticipate an easier time my second round though, but I am still concerned about the amount of time I spend on emails that are mainly technical or following directions problems. I'd rather be focusing on content, but that is not what most of my email is about. However, this frustration is balanced by the rewards that distance faculty receive from participating in this form of education," "However, this sense of frustration is balanced by the satisfaction this faculty member receives from participating in this type of education, "Also I love to teach. I don't get the same level of feedback and interaction as I do in the classroom and there is less opportunity to observe a students' "a-ha" moments when they do it on their own time. So I miss that kind of gratification."

Other distance faculty complained about the time distance education takes away from other professional opportunities, "It takes all of my spare time I could use for research and writing," "It takes up much time that could be spent to serve on committees or keep up with my discipline," and "Very time consuming, takes away time from other teaching efforts and professional development."

Effect of Different Rewards on Faculty Participation in Distance

Distance education faculty responded that their decision to participate might be dependent upon the kinds of rewards that were available and others indicated that these rewards would have no effect. Their comments are as follows: "I insist on days off campus. If that's not possible, then I am out," "I'd continue to teach my max distance learning load (2 courses) with a third as on-line," "Depends if they are real rewards," "It depends on the rewards," "If positive, then positive, if negative, then negative," "I could do a better job with more release time," "I wouldn't participate if it wasn't mandated," "Not sure."

With the exception of one faculty member, the vast majority of classroom faculty responded that if different rewards were available, these would still not impact their decision not to participate. Their comments are as follows, "Rewards are not central to my feelings," "It would encourage me," "Not much," "It wouldn't affect my decision," "My decision would most probably be affected by the reward," "Would have to see the structure." "I am already involved, but more release time might get others involved." "A fair amount of release time might make it more palatable." "I would not participate as an overload assignment." "It wouldn't affect my decision not to participate." "It wouldn't affect my decision at all."

General Comments about Distance Education

In further comments the division chairs expressed concerns about the quality of distance education, and how well distance education is administered at their own campuses. Their comments are as follows: "The platform is only a tool. Distance education is still dependent upon the professionalism and hard work of the faculty involved. Quality over quantity." " This institution is doing pretty well." "Distance education is considered a sham by many faculty. Teaching a course delivered by TV often involves very little real effort. Students watch tapes, are given objective questions from a test bank and the exams are machine graded."

Some distance faculty criticized the pedagogy used in distance education, the learning that takes place in a distance environment, and its appropriateness for the community college. Distance faculty's comments are as follows.

"It (distance education) needs to become a fully integrated part of the culture of X College," "It is not right for all students or all faculty." " Distance learning is not for everyone and it takes a highly motivated student. Support from textbooks needs to improve as well." "Faculty do not teach, rather they administer a course in distance

education." "It is draining many good students from the classroom courses, leading to worse classroom courses in terms of student quality and their production."
"My classes are really based upon discussion and spontaneity. In addition I require a great deal of reading, research and writing. Such teaching is, I believe, best done one to one. Also I have a deep philosophical and political objections to distance learning. When used in remote settings, distance delivery makes sense, otherwise it does not. The very students who prefer to work alone often most need interaction. Furthermore I believe that the increased reliance by public colleges upon distance learning will lead ultimately to an even more pronounced inequity between elite schools and everyone else. College is not just about getting your ticket punched – distance learning , when applied too broadly makes it so." "Yes, forcing it down our throats turned me off to it!" "I question if it is appropriate for first time "traditional Distance faculty's higher usage of the internet may indicate that they use technology more frequently to interact with students than do classroom faculty.

Classroom faculty comments were positive and negative, focusing on the strengths and limitations of distance education. Their comments are as follows:
"Let's get on with it!" "It's not for every instructor. Also there needs to be a screening process to determine which students will potentially be successful." "I think it's okay if there is no other way students could participate in a class, but I don't think it should be used to avoid hiring a sufficient number of instructors. Face to face contact is more humanizing." "Most students at the community college are not self sufficient learners. They lack the study skills as freshmen that would be necessary to succeed at distance learning." " I had some difficulty classifying some of my answers because I have

developed, but not yet taught a web based course." "I think distance education is a good thing – I've have taken a distance education course. However, I don't think faculty should be required to develop distance courses if they do not have the expertise. In addition, this method of delivery is not necessarily a more effective method of delivery." "Not appropriate for our discipline." "Skeptical about how distance education meets the AAHE (American Association of Higher Education) principles for undergraduate students."

The Primary Data Collection

Institutional Sample

Five hundred faculty who taught only classroom courses during the fall semester of 2001, seventy-two faculty who taught only distance education courses or distance education and classroom courses and fifteen division chairs were surveyed. The researcher chose to survey division chairs as they have the most frequent interaction with faculty (as academic department chairpersons report directly to them) and division chairs are also responsible for assigning faculty teaching loads and evaluating all faculty within their division.

Response Rate

The researcher received replies from fifty-one distance faculty who taught both distance and classroom courses, six faculty (within that group of fifty-one faculty) who taught only distance courses, one-hundred and sixteen faculty who taught only traditional classroom based courses and thirteen division chairs. Twenty-three percent of classroom faculty, 70% of distance faculty and 87% of division chairs responded to this survey. Two distance education administrators were interviewed about how the distance education program is administered at their community college, the manner in which resources are allocated to their program and how these budgetary decisions impact their ability to administer quality distance programs. They were also asked to discuss factors that they believe motivate or deter faculty from participating in distance education, and how the presence or lack of rewards or support has impacted the College's ability to recruit and retain faculty in distance education.

A Description of the Population and Sample

The population of this study included division chairs and faculty at a community college in the Southeastern part of the United States whose teaching loads consisted of (1) distance education courses and classroom courses; (2) solely distance courses; (3) solely classroom courses. The dean and associate dean of distance education were also interviewed for this study.

Distance Education Delivery Systems:

The community college where this study was conducted offers courses via distance education using four methods: (1) written correspondence courses through the use of the United States Postal Service; (2) Blackboard via the internet; (3) tele-courses; (4) audio visual courses. Tele-courses are delivered through the seven cable television systems currently available in the state where the community college operates. The audio-visual courses are provided through an a-synchronous learning network. Blackboard 5 is a comprehensive and flexible e-Learning software platform that delivers a course management system, and, with a Level Two or Level Three license, a customizable institution-wide portal and online communities. In addition, a Level Three license includes advanced integration tools and APIs to seamlessly integrate Blackboard

5 with existing institution systems (http://www.blackboard.com/). The College's Technical Application Center provides online training, video conferencing schedules and resources, technology application tips, online technology resources, free software downloads for all faculty and staff.

This study did not ask faculty to identify which type of distance education delivery system they used to transmit their courses. Thus, the reader can interpret any reference that faculty make to their distance education courses within the context of the delivery systems previously cited.

Sampling Procedures

The Office of Institutional Research at the community college where the study was conducted generated a list of the 500 full-time faculty who taught courses in a traditional classroom setting and seventy-two faculty who taught distance and classroom courses or solely distance courses during this 2001 fall semester.

Instrumentation

Survey research methodology was used for this study to explore what factors motivate and/or deter faculty from teaching via distance education. Survey data provides a means of systematic data collection in which data can be gathered using qualitative and quantitative methodologies (Borg and Gall, 1989). Five-hundred classroom faculty members, seventy-two distance classroom faculty and fifteen division chairs received cover letters that provided an overview of the study and a copy of the survey. Faculty and division chairs received the same survey, with the exception that division chairs' surveys contained five additional questions that addressed faculty participation in distance education within their division. Faculty were asked to complete the survey and return it to the researcher via inter-campus mail.

The researcher also interviewed the dean and associate dean of distance learning about their perceptions of the growth and development of the distance education program, and what factors they perceived as influencing faculty to participate in distance education. The interview was not too tightly structured and allowed the both interviewees time to reconstruct, from their perspective, the growth and development of the Department of Distance Learning. The researcher chose to interview the dean and associate dean of distance learning, as they are directly responsible for the administration of all distance education courses across all five campuses. The interview format allowed the researcher to more easily glean a sense of the history and development of distance education at the community college and it allowed for a freer exchange of questions and answers about its present growth and future development. Interviews are more flexible and are not encumbered by the structural limitations of a survey or the length of time and energy an email question and answer session would require (McMillan & Schumaker, 1997).

The researcher prepared a list of interview questions that addressed the role and the priority distance education occupies within the community college system, the college's plans for recruiting and retaining faculty, and the role that the Department of Distance Learning presently plays within the college and how the dean perceives its future role. As the researcher proceeded with the interviews, she was also mindful to keep the interviewees focused on the question at hand which addressed factors specific to the institution, that affect the administration and future development of the Office of Distance Education.

Survey Outline

The survey of deans and division chairs was based upon a survey developed by Betts (1998). Upon the completion of the test pilot the instrument was revised and questions that yielded duplicate responses were deleted. The revised instrument included sections on (1) demographics: (2) faculty participation in distance education; (3) kind of distance education training faculty have received or would like to receive; (4) quality of support that distance education faculty currently receive; (5) faculty attitudes towards rewards for participating in distance education; (6) the relationship between the community college and distance education; (7) factors that motivate faculty to participate in distance education; (8) factors that inhibit faculty from participating in distance education; (9) how faculty perceive distance education as having changed the teaching role of faculty and (10) how this change has affected their willingness to participate.

Validity and Reliability

"Test reliability refers to the consistency of measurement, the extent to which the results are similar over different forms of the same instrument or occasions of data collection" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997). Validity is the extent to which inferences drawn from data are appropriate, meaningful and useful (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

To ensure validity and reliability of this survey, the instrument was test piloted twice, once with forty faculty and five division chairs at four community colleges and a second time with ten faculty at another community college. Survey questions were based upon Betts (1998) survey and salient topics cited in the literature (Strain, 1987;

Gunawardena, 1992; Dillon and Walsh, 1992; Hassenplug and Harnish, 1998; Beaudoin, 1990; Kubala, 2000; Moore and Kearsley, 1996). Cronbach alphas were run and they produced scores of .85 and above, thus confirming the instrument's reliability and validity.

Ethical Considerations

All community colleges, faculty, division chairs and administrators involved in this study were guaranteed anonymity and the completion of the survey was completely voluntary. A letter accompanied the survey that explained the purpose of the survey and the value their participation would add to the data collected. Faculty were instructed not to include their names or social security numbers. The researcher included her phone number and email in the cover letter so faculty could contact her if they had any concerns, reservations or questions. There were no risks or side effects to completing this survey.

Permission to use survey and make modifications

Full permission was granted by Dr. Kristen Betts to use her instrument and modify it as was deemed necessary.

Data Collection Procedures, and Prescription of Data Analysis Employed in this Study

The instrument was reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Committee at the George Washington University and by the director of institutional research , the human subjects committee and provosts at each of the campuses at the community college where the primary data was collected. The surveys were accompanied by a cover letter explaining the rationale of the study and were sent via campus mail to 500 faculty who were teaching solely classroom courses, 73 faculty who were either teaching solely distance courses or a combination of distance and classroom courses and 15 division chairs. Faculty and division chairs were asked to complete the survey and return it to the researcher in an enclosed envelope. While faculty were completing the survey, the researcher also interviewed distance education administrators. The researcher taped the interviews, transcribed them, and provided the administrators with a copy of the transcription. The survey results were entered into SPSS version 10.0 whereby descriptive statistics were calculated. The interview questions had been designed to be topically parallel to the survey questions and were coded according to the topics listed on the survey (demographics, participation, training, rewards, support, inhibitors, motivators and budgetary/cost.

CHAPTER IV

This chapter is comprised of three sections. Section I discusses the demographics of classroom and distance faculty and division chairs who participated in this survey. Section II presents the summary of responses to survey questions in the areas of (1) use of technology; (2) participation; (3) training; (4) support; (5) rewards; (6) motivators; (7) inhibitors; (8) the mission of the community college; (9) distance education and the interviews with two distance education administrators. Section III presents an analysis of the findings in relation to the hypothesis and research questions outlined in chapter three.

Section I - Demographics

Academic Divisions

The divisions in which the 116 classroom faculty, who responded to the survey, taught included (1) liberal arts (32%); (2) math, science and engineering (24%); (3) business and technologies (16.5%); (4) social sciences (11.2%); (5) health technologies (8%); (6) visual and performing arts (6%); (7) nursing (2%). The 51 distance faculty, who responded to the survey reported that they taught in the following divisions: (1) business and technologies (39%); (2) liberal arts (35%); (3) math, science and engineering (18%); (4) health technologies (5.9%). The thirteen division chairs who responded to the survey represented the following disciplines: (1) math, science and engineering (31%); (2) business and technologies (23%); (3) liberal arts (15%); (4) social sciences (15.5%); (5) nursing (7.7%); (6) visual and performing arts (7.7%).

Age of Faculty and Division Chairs

Seventy-two percent of all survey respondents reported that they were over the age of 45. Sixty-nine percent of classroom faculty described themselves as being over 45 years of age and thirty-one percent said that they were between the ages of 30 and 40. Seventy-six percent of distance faculty reported that they were over the age of 45 and twenty-three percent reported that they were over the age of 30. Ninety-two percent of the division chairs described themselves as being over the age of 45, while only 8% were between the ages of 30 and 45.

Appointment Status: Tenure vs. Contract

Eighty-five percent of classroom faculty and eighty-four percent of distance faculty were hired on a contract basis. However, while there was a higher percentage of distance faculty who held tenured positions (11%) compared to classroom faculty (5%), a higher percentage of classroom faculty held tenure track positions (8%) than there were distance faculty who held tenure track positions (2%).

Faculty Rank

Classroom faculty were almost evenly divided amongst the ranks of professor (28.5%), associate professor (27%), and assistant professor (28%). Instructors accounted for only 17.5% of the classroom faculty. In contrast, there were a higher percentage of distance faculty who held the ranks of professor (41%) and assistant professor (39.5%). Among distance faculty, associate professors only accounted for 16% and instructors accounted for 4%.

Years Taught at the Community College

Distance and classroom faculty had taught at the community college for almost the same mean number of years with classroom faculty having taught an average of 16.5 years and distance faculty having taught an average of 17.5 years. Division chairs had taught at the community college for a slightly longer period of time, as their average number of years teaching was 20, while the mean number of years they had been chair was 16.

Gender

Of the classroom and distance faculty and division chairs who responded to the survey, a higher percentage of respondents were women (59%), versus the number of respondents who were men (40%). The ratio of women to men teaching distance education courses was almost two to one, with women representing 65% and men averaging 33%. There was also a higher percentage of women who were division chairs (61%) to men (39%). Amongst classroom faculty, there was a smaller gap between men and women, with women averaging 56% and men averaging 43%.

Teaching Load

Distance faculty who taught both distance and classroom courses appear to have a heavier teaching load than did their colleagues who only taught classroom courses. The mean number of classroom courses that distance faculty taught each semester was 3.5 and the mean number of distance courses they taught each semester is 2.25. Of the 51 distance faculty who responded to the survey, six distance faculty hadn't taught any classroom courses and the average of the distance courses they taught each semester was 3.5 courses each semester. Classroom faculty taught on average 4.35 classroom courses. This calculation of classroom load reflected the number of different courses that faculty taught and did not count course loads by the number of sections that faculty taught. Division chairs were required to teach one course each academic year which can be taught either in a traditional classroom setting or via distance. Chairs taught an average of 1.40 courses in a traditional classroom setting and an average of .38 courses via distance each year. Of the thirteen chairs who responded to the survey, only five had taught distance courses.

Section II - Use of Technology to Communicate with Students, Staff and Faculty

The technologies which distance faculty cited as having most frequently used to communicate with faculty, staff and students were: (1) two-way audio visual interactive conferencing (12%); (2) two-way on-line computer conferencing (17.6%); (3) internet (54%); (4) email (82%); (5) telephone (12%). Only 6% of classroom faculty used Blackboard as a means to communicate with their students. Classroom faculty's usage of technology was lower than that of distance faculty in all areas except email. Faculty who taught only classroom courses used the following technologies as a means to communicate with their students: (1) two-way audio visual interactive conferencing (2.6%); (2) two-way on-line computer conferencing (5.2%); (3) internet (46%); (4) email (86%). Only 4.5% of classroom faculty used Blackboard as a means of communicating with students. Division chairs' use of technology was lower than distance faculty's in all areas except (1) two-way audio visual conferencing (15.5%); (2) Blackboard (8%); (3) email (92%). Chairs reported using the following technology as a means of communicating with their faculty, students and staff: (1) two-way on-line computer conferencing (7.7%); (2) internet (23%); (3) telephone (8%).

Use of Technology to Support Courses

Distance faculty were cited as using the following technologies to support their courses: (1) videotape (60%); (2) internet (84.5%); (3) email (88%); (4) cable television (24%); (5) two-way on-line computer conferencing (24%); (6) CD roms (37%); (7) two way audio visual conferencing (10%). Four percent or less of distance faculty reported that they used the following technologies: (1) language labs (4%); (2) voice mail; (3) Blackboard, course software, (3) US postal service; (4) digital cameras; (5) course guides; (6) Power Point.

Overall classroom faculty reflected a lower use of technology than distance faculty: (1) internet (73%); (2) email (71%); (3) two-way on-line computer conferencing (7%). Less than 4% of all classroom faculty reported using the following technologies to support their courses: (1) one-way live video; (2) two-way audio (.9%); (3) language labs (.9%); (4) voice mail (2.6%); (5) cassettes and film (1.7%); (6) Blackboard (3.4%); (7) slides (.3.5%); (8) course software (.9%); (10) music CDs (.9%); (11) calculators (.9%); (12) marker boards (.9%); (13) web-board (.9%); (14) smart classroom (.9%); (15) movies (1.7%); (16) computer disks (.9%); (17) chemistry and biology disks (.9%); (18) digital cameras (.9%); (19)fax machine (.9%). The only areas in which classroom faculty cited a higher usage of technology than distance faculty were videotapes (68%) and CD roms (40%).

Division chairs also reflected a lower usage of technology than distance and classroom faculty in the following areas: (1) internet (77%); (2) email (69%); (3) language lab (8%); voice mail (8%); (4) cable television (8%); (5) two-way on-line computer conferencing (8%). The technologies in which chairs showed a higher rate of usage than distance or classroom faculty included: (1) digital video production (8%); (2) two way audio visual interactive conferencing (15%); (3) CD rom (39%); (4) videotape (39%).

Section III - Participation in Distance Education

Length of Participation in Distance Education

The mean number of years in which distance faculty have participated in distance education was 4.5. However, there was a wide range in the years of experience that distance faculty had in this field, i.e., 28% of distance faculty had over ten years of experience, 17% of distance faculty had between six and nine years of experience, 33% of distance faculty had between two and five years of experience and 14% had one year of experience. As expected, classroom faculty participation rates in distance education were far lower than those of distance faculty: 1% had ten or more years of experience in distance education, 5% had two to five years of experience and 4% had only one year of previous experience. Division chairs' participation in distance education reflected a lower degree than that of distance faculty, but higher degree than that of classroom faculty. Chairs' experience was equally divided amongst 10 or more years of experience (15%), two to five years experience (15%) and one year (15%).

Distance Teaching, Co-Teaching and Course Design

When the question "Have you ever been asked to teach a distance course?" was posed to distance faculty, 90% responded that they had been asked to teach such a course, although some faculty noted that they had not been asked, but volunteered to teach distance classes. Many faculty noted in open ended survey questions that co-teaching was not an option at the community college where they are presently teaching. Ninety two percent of distance faculty said that they had taught distance courses and ninety six percent replied that they would continue to teach these courses in the future. Only eleven percent of distance faculty said that they had been asked to co-teach a course and they had taught it. Forty-one percent of distance faculty said that they would co-teach a distance course in the future. Eighty-four percent of distance faculty replied that they were asked to design a distance course and eighty-two percent actually designed one. Eighty-four percent of distance faculty said that they would design a distance course in the future.

Twenty-one percent of classroom faculty said that they had been asked to teach a distance course and eleven percent replied that they had actually taught one. Forty-eight percent replied that they would like to teach a distance course in the future. When classroom faculty were posed the question if they had ever been asked to co-teach a course, 3.5% replied that they had been asked, and 1% percent replied that they had co-taught one. Forty-three percent said that they would co-teach a distance course in the future. Twenty percent reported that they had been asked to design a distance course and 12% indicated that they had designed one. Forty-six percent of classroom faculty indicated that they would like to design a distance course in the future.

When division chairs were posed the question if they had ever been asked to teach a distance course, 69% (nine chair persons) replied that they had been asked and 62% (eight chair persons) replied that they had taught a distance course. Sixty-nine percent of division chairs indicated that they would like to teach a distance course in the future. Fifteen percent (two chairpersons) reported that they had been asked to co-teach a distance course and 7.7% (one chairperson) replied that he had co-taught a course. Sixty-nine percent of chairpersons replied that they would consider co-teaching a distance course in the future. Division chairs expressed an even greater interest in the design of distance courses. When asked if they had ever been invited to design one, 62% of chairpersons (eight chairs) replied that they had been asked, and 46% (six chair persons) replied that they had actually designed a distance course. Seventy-seven percent of chairs (ten chairs) replied that in the future they would be interested in designing distance courses. Chairs who have not taught via distance cited lack of time and their administrative duties as preventing them from having the time.

Reasons Cited for No Longer Teaching Distance Education or Not Wanting to teach Distance Education in the Future

Of the classroom faculty who responded that they did not want to teach distance education courses, many cited lack of time as the reason why they would not participate. Others cited concerns about the quality of distance education courses. "I am a teacher and I don't feel that distance education is teaching." " I don't like distance education. It cheapens education! I will not be a talking head!" "I am not interested in teaching students with students not physically present. I would worry about the identity and integrity of student work." "It's a trendy idea – like the computer training of the 80's." Some classroom faculty replied that their academic disciplines were not conducive to distance delivery. "I don't believe that you can teach English as a second language except in the classroom – not by distance teaching" I teach drawing and design. I feel it's important to have a hands-on, one to one approach in these art studio classes." One faculty member expressed the need to have a faculty mentor assigned to her who could guide her through the process of converting her classroom course to a web-based format "I would like a faculty mentor who understands the health technology issues…. and could discuss the pros and cons of the different ways of doing a distance course."

Other classroom faculty cited the heavy workload of distance education as the reason why they have not become involved in this delivery method. "Any faculty member involved in distance education must spend endless hours being available to students, some of whom are night owls and expect you to be so too. No extra consideration, appreciation or remediation accords to distance faculty. Their time is abused." A small percentage of faculty cited problems with technology used to deliver synchronous classes and how this impacted their decision not to pursue distance teaching. "There were numerous equipment failures. Even when it worked it was inadequate for teaching math. It was an enormous amount of additional unpaid work for me and yet there was a very high withdrawal rate." Classroom faculty also commented how distance education was inappropriate for the traditional age college student at the community college. " I was disappointed with the performance of most of my students and I was also concerned with cheating (students who do not do their own work)." One faculty member referenced the problems that he encountered due to the College's policy of rolling admissions which allows students to begin distance courses at any point during the year. "Students took too long to start the course. This produced difficulties including students trying to do too much in too little time at the end of enrollment."

Classroom faculty who had previously taught via distance cited many of the same reasons as did their colleagues for not participating, mainly the heavy workload involved in delivering distance courses, the lack of rewards and the absence of intellectual property rights. "I never felt that I was fairly compensated for all the additional work that distance education requires." " The preparation and workload are extremely demanding. The teacher is responsible for all aspects of the course plus technical and support areas."

"Designing classes is very labor intensive and not properly remunerated at the community college where I presently teach. I receive no compensation for the time spent developing the distance course, yet I do not own the copyright to it." Classroom faculty also criticized the way in which a faculty load is calculated and a few said that if they taught distance courses, they would generate more teaching credits than they need and therefore would not be paid for them.

The Impact the Absence of the Research Role has had upon Faculty's Decision of Whether or not to Participate in Distance Education

When faculty and division chairs were asked if the absence of the research role had any impact on their ability or desire to participate in distance education, they all replied that the absence of this role didn't have any impact on their participation or lack of participation in distance education. A large percentage of faculty replied that their teaching loads do not leave them with anytime to conduct research. Some added that their teaching loads contributed to their need for release time in order to complete distance education training. "My teaching load makes it imperative that release time be made available for developing distance courses." Only two faculty noted that it had a positive impact on the opportunity to engage in distance education. "The absence of the research role enhances my ability to develop distance education courses because I don't have to devote time to research." " The absence of the research role has no impact on me. Good distance education teachers would be good traditional teachers and they would do the necessary research and training anyway."

Distance Education Delivery Systems that are Currently Used

Distance faculty replied that they use the following technologies to deliver or support their distance education courses: (1) cable television (20%); (2) two way on-line computer conferencing (20%); (3) CD rom (20%); (4) internet (84%); (5) videotape (47%); (6) email (75%); (7) voice mail (10%). Other technologies were cited as being used by 6% or less faculty included: (1) textbook mail-in assignments (2%); (2) Blackboard discussion (6%); (3) US mail (2%); (4) faculty or department web pages (2%). Division chairs' use of technology in their course delivery included the following: (1) two-way audio visual interactive conferencing (8%); (2) CD roms (8%); (3) internet (23%); (4) video tape (8%); (5) email (31%); (6) voicemail (15%); (7) discussion forum (8%).

Section IV - Training

Percentage of Faculty who did or did not Receive Distance Education Training

Fifty-six percent of distance faculty replied that they had received formal distance education training, while forty-three percent replied that they had not. The faculty who didn't receive distance training learned to deliver their courses with the help of other faculty (18%), by doing it themselves (12%), with the one to one assistance of a course technologist (6%) and from enrollment in a doctoral program (2%). Thirty-one percent of distance faculty replied that they would be interested in receiving training in the future.

Distance faculty also stressed that they would only attend training if it was relevant to the courses they now deliver or if they had the time. "Most training focuses on things that would not work in my classes." " Maybe – only if the course were valuable to my teaching." One faculty member also expressed the need for pedagogical training in distance education. " Most workshops are not relevant to my needs and are taught by technicians rather than by teachers with a depth of experience." "I might be interested in training. Depends on time availability and … where classes are held, the duration of the classes and who is teaching them." "I might consider additional training as long as they don't require a huge commitment." "I might be interested in additional training if there is new information which might be helpful."

Of those distance faculty who expressed an interest in receiving further distance education, they were most motivated by a curiosity to learn new delivery methods and to exchange ideas with their distance colleagues about what delivery systems work best. "Yes, I would be interested in further training, as it's always good to see what others are doing. "It provides feedback about your own course and you can learn from others who are involved in distance education."

Sixteen percent of classroom faculty replied that they had received formal distance education training. Only seven percent replied that they would be interested in future distance education training. Those faculty who didn't receive training learned how to deliver distance courses from other co-workers and learning on their own (2.6%) and with the one to one assistance from a course technologist (1%).

The most commonly cited reason by classroom faculty for not receiving distance training was disinterest and dislike for distance education. Faculty complained that the distance education experience was inferior to that of the classroom as it lacked opportunities for interaction, immediate responses, ability to identify students' difficulties in understanding the material and in its quality which was thought to be questionable. "

I'm not a fan of distance education. It's not for me. I like the live interaction of students. They often tell me that I make clear through active face to face discussions what was once unclear in the text." "I believe that classroom teaching is the best approach." " My interest is in teaching face to face and that keeps me busy. No time to devote to training that I am not interested in." "I like personal contact with my students." "I became a teacher because of the classroom experience. I am not interested in giving that up. I love it" "I am a highly effective classroom teacher and have no trouble filling traditional format classes. See no reason to do something that would not utilize my strongest skills as a teacher."

Some faculty cited that they did not seek distance training as their teaching loads do not leave them any time. "Depends upon the length of training and how it affects the quality of instruction." "Not enough time at the present. I have other learning priorities." "Too little time now, perhaps in the future." "Yes, I would like to receive additional training. I would enjoy a minimum updating regarding techniques now being employed in distance education." Yes, I would like to receive further training, but my heavy teaching load and other responsibilities probably would forestall my participation."

Other faculty noted that their academic disciplines are not conducive to distance education delivery, thus they see no need for training. "I teach speech communication. I think the best part of the course is getting to know students and having them interact face to face. This is key to understanding communication concepts. I don't want these courses taught through distance education." "I didn't find distance education sufficiently satisfying to me as an educator. I am not sure that distance learning is as effective in my field (psychology) as classroom based education." "It is not practical for English as a second language students to learn English by distance as it exists right now. It may be possible down the road." "English as a second language students need to be in a classroom where they can physically interact, not by computer." "The nature of the course material in my opinion is not conducive to distance education. As of this time, I don 't teach public speaking or other courses which might be taught through distance education." "I feel that the art course studio material that I cover in my entry level courses requires a hands-on approach."

Fifty three percent of division chairs (7 chair persons) reported that they had received formal distance education training. Twenty-three percent (3 chair persons) indicated that they would be interested in future distance training. Those division chairs who had not received training stated that they learned to deliver their courses from self-pace coursework (8%) and by delivering courses on their own (8%). The chairs who said that they would not be interested in training cited lack of interest and no plans to use it in the future.

Years in which Faculty Received Training

Twenty percent of distance faculty received training in 2001 and 2000 and eight percent received training in 1999. Less than four percent received training between the years 1992 and 1998. Seven percent of classroom faculty also received their training in 2001 and 2000. Less than 4% of classroom faculty received their training between 1980 and 1999. Twenty three percent of division chairs (3 chair persons) received training in 2001 and 2000. The remaining 15.5 % of division chairs (two chair persons) received their training in 1998.

Where Faculty Received Training

Of the distance faculty who responded to this question, forty-one percent of them replied that they received training from the community college where they are currently teaching. The majority of classroom faculty who answered this question (8%) also replied that they too received training at the community college where they now teach. Less than three percent of classroom faculty indicated that they had received training at four-year colleges and a distance education workshop. Likewise, the majority of division chairs (31%, or 8 chairpersons) also received their training at the community college where they now teach.

Delivery Systems Faculty Were Trained to Use

The majority of distance faculty received training in the following course delivery methods: (1) Black Board (24%); (2) First Class (14%); (3) telecourse (10%). Other methods included (1) internet (6%); (2) cable television (4%); (3) two-way audio visual conferencing (2%); (4) V-Tel CVN (2%); (5) video (4%); (6) compressed video (6%); (7) Front Page (2%); (8) Course in a box (2%). Four percent of classroom faculty replied that they were trained to use Blackboard and three percent were trained to use First Class. Other delivery systems which they claimed to have received training included : (1) two way on-line computer conferencing (1%); (2) internet (1%); (3) two way audio visual conferencing (1%); (4) compressed video (1%). A higher percent of division chairs were trained in a greater variety of delivery systems than were classroom faculty. Chairs training included: (1) Blackboard (15%); (2) Tele-course (15.5%); (3) Internet (8%); (4) V-tel CVN (8%); (5) compressed video (8%).

Release Time for Training

When all survey recipients were asked if they received release time in order to participate in distance education training, only one percent of classroom faculty and ten percent of distance faculty replied that they received release time.

Level of Interest in Training for those Faculty who never received distance education training

Of survey respondents who had not received any distance training, 24% of distance faculty (twelve faculty), 33% of classroom faculty (thirty-eight faculty) and 39% of division chairs (five chair persons) replied that they wanted to receive training in distance education.

Areas in which Faculty Would Like to Receive Training

Classroom and distance faculty and division chairs expressed an interest in receiving distance training in the following areas.

Distance faculty wanted to receive training in (1) two-way audio, one way video conferencing (10%); (2) two-way audio visual interactive conferencing (26%); (3) cable television (16%); (4) CD roms (14%); (5) email (8%); (6) internet (32%); (7) two-way on-line computer conferencing (18%); (8)videotapes (6%). Classroom faculty voiced interest in receiving training in (1) two-way audio, one way video conferencing (14%); (2) two-way audio visual interactive conferencing (28%); (3) cable television (13%); (4) CD roms (13%); (5) email (12%); (6) internet (22%); (7) two-way on-line computer conferencing (20%); (8) videotapes (12%).

Division chairs responded that they wanted to receive training in (1) two-way audio, one way video conferencing (8%); (2) two-way audio visual interactive conferencing (39%); (3) cable television (8%); (4) CD roms (8%); (5) internet (23%); (6) two-way on-line computer conferencing (15.5%).

Faculty Rating of Technical and Administrative Support, and Technical and Pedagogical Training

Distance faculty gave the following ratings to technical support: (1) very good (47%); (2) good (27%); (3) fair (6%); (4) inadequate (2%). They rated administrative support as (1) very good (37%); (2) good (35%); (3) fair (10%); (4) inadequate (2%). Their rating of technical training was more evenly distributed with (1) very good (24%); (2) good (31%); (3) fair (14%); (4) inadequate (4%). Their rating of pedagogical training mirrored the same distribution as that of technical training with (1) very good (24%); (2) good (24%); (3) fair (18%); (4) inadequate (6%). Only three division chairs currently engage in distance education, therefore their responses were recorded in terms of numbers rather than percentages. Two division chairs replied that the administrative, technical support, technical training was very good and one chair reported all three categories as being good. One division chair rated the pedagogical training as having been good.

Section IV - Delivery Systems

Preferred Delivery Mode – Synchronous or A-Synchronous

Distance faculty and division chairs both preferred to deliver courses in an a-synchronous mode. Classroom faculty preferred to deliver their courses in a synchronous manner. Table 11 presents the order of preference from each group.

Table 11

Distance faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Preferred Mode of Course Delivery

	Synchronous	**A-Synchronous**	**Both Synchronous and A-Synchronous**	**Undecided**
All Distance faculty	16%	41%	24%	0%
Distance Faculty who teach only distance courses	14%	42%	28%	0%
Classroom faculty	43%	10%	9%	0%
Division Chairs	25%	25%	25%	25%

The vast majority of classroom faculty preferred synchronous delivery as they perceived that it would be most identical to a traditional classroom environment. Consequently it would provide them with all the benefits of classroom learning that include immediate feedback from their students, face to face interaction with their students (which some claimed as being vital to the learning experience), the ability to immediately detect learning difficulties and that energy that they claimed only classroom teaching could provide. Comments from classroom faculty who preferred a synchronous environment included: "So I can read my students' expressions." " I want synchronous interaction or I will feel lost in the classroom." " Synchronous environments ….. generate energy close to what the face to face environment generates." "Synchronous direct and active interaction is the best learning environment." "Synchronous environments provide the spark that is necessary for teachers and students." "Synchronous learning is more appropriate for didactic and group interaction. One cannot improve human communication as much as possible without face to face contact, reading non-verbal behavior and immediate feedback." "I enjoy the face to face interaction with students mostly because I am a visual learner, so I rely upon facial expressions to enhance my communication." "I prefer synchronous environments so I have a feel for how the student is doing." "In synchronous environments students can exchange their ideas, argue, fight and finally agree on a solution. You cannot do this from a distance with time delay." "I think I would prefer synchronous. I depend upon immediate feedback from my students to know whether they get what I am saying and tailor a class to the type of response I get. I often get students with a dramatic variety of English skills and experience in health care settings so no one plan works for me." "I would prefer synchronous as I still need a physical class to create a sense of camaraderie."

Some classroom faculty perceived only difficulties that could arise as a result of a non-synchronous environment. " I don't like the idea of a timed delay as with non-synchronous because I feel the lesson is not flowing well. Most definitely information could be lost or misinterpreted." " Personally I believe that in general, a lag time from student learning to asking questions to getting responses to a question can be a detriment to the learning curve."

There were classroom faculty who perceived some value to non-synchronous delivery, mainly that it gave both the student and professor time to reflect upon their work and prepare responses to others' comments. "I prefer non-synchronous, as I like to think and gather my thoughts in order to plan ahead." " Non-synchronous adds the benefit of time convenience for both instructions and students. I think work would be more thoughtful or well written." "I would prefer the non-synchronous environment to facilitate a necessary hesitation to afford the student the best possible answer."

The vast majority of distance faculty preferred to deliver their courses in a non-synchronous mode mainly because (1) it allows for learning to occur at times that are convenient for faculty and students, (2) the time delay allows students more time to reflect upon their work; (3) it enables students who otherwise couldn't enroll in college courses to complete them through distance learning. "Easier for students to access the course when it's convenient for them." "Students are employed and can respond during non-working hours." "I think the accuracy of the subject matter and higher quality of students' work lends credibility to distance education. When you have time to think and prepare a response." " I support the idea of 'any time any place learning'. It increases the flexibility of participation. "Attempts to use both synchronous and non-synchronous for the same course have resulted in poor attendance." " I prefer non-synchronous for the time to prepare and adjust." Only one faculty member had a negative comment about non-synchronous delivery, "Non-synchronous allows faculty and students more flexibility in time management, but may encourage procrastination and W grades given. Also less time for updating materials, especially if they are video-taped or canned."

Division chairs were almost evenly divided over their preference for synchronous (25% or three division chairs), non-synchronous (25% or three division chairs), a combination of synchronous and non-synchronous (25% or three division chairs) and 25% of chairs who didn't have experience in either type of delivery and therefore were undecided as to which one they preferred.

Chairs who preferred synchronous environments cited the following reasons: "Students would benefit from other students' comments, and questions could be answered that benefited the entire class." " It's a more robust learning environment." "I prefer synchronous as much on-line format is part of the instructional delivery method which is very time consuming." "Synchronous would be more efficient, although the technique is more susceptible to technological interference."

Chairs who replied that they would rather engage in non-synchronous courses provided the following rationale for their response: " I prefer non-synchronous as it is not as demanding on my time." "I can control when I respond to students' questions." "Non-synchronous allows students who are busy to complete the course at their own pace." "I am more interested in developing a non-synchronous class so that students could access it from any site."

Faculty Responsibility in Designing and Delivering Distance Education Courses

Distance education faculty were almost equally divided in their self selected approach to the design and delivery of their courses. Forty-one percent of distance faculty replied that they are solely responsible for delivery and design, and 41% responded that they are using a combined approach of consulting with other faculty and course designers and working on their own. Ten percent responded that they are engaged in a systems approach where they work with course designers to design and deliver their courses while six percent indicated that they were engaged in a combined approach of consulting with other faculty and course designers, but stressed that they were doing much of the design on their own.

Distance faculty survey comments revealed that while some of them were open to new ideas and learning new technologies, they ultimately wanted to be in control of the content, design and delivery of their own courses. "While I prefer a combined approach of working with course designers. I prefer to have as much control as possible over my courses. I do not wish to go through layers of bureaucracy to maintain and revise my courses." "I want to learn from others and then apply what I think works best." "I develop my own courses, but have access to course designers and other faculty if I need assistance. I prefer the flexibility creating my own courses provides."

When classroom faculty were asked which approach they would like to use (The "systems approach" of collaborative efforts with other faculty and course designers; a "combined approach" of consulting with faculty and course designers and working on their own to deliver courses" or being solely responsible for the design and delivery of courses) 27% replied that they would rather be solely responsible for the design and delivery of their own courses, 18% replied that they would rather engage in the systems approach and 9% replied that they would like to engage in the combined approach. When division chairs were asked the same question of which approach they preferred, 15.5% responded that they preferred the combined approach, while 8% wanted to be solely responsible for their own course design and delivery and another 8% wanted to engage in the systems approach.

Classroom faculty were also divided over the question as to which type of approach they would use if they were teaching courses via distance. Twenty-seven percent reported that they would prefer to be totally responsible for the design and delivery. Eighteen percent replied that they would like to engage in a "systems" approach whereby they would work with other faculty and course designers to create and deliver their courses. Only nine percent said that they would prefer a combined approach of consulting course designers and work on their own to deliver their courses. Classroom faculty's comments echoed their colleagues who teach distance education, in regards to their desire to retain control over the course design process and the final product." "Unsure whether I want to participate in a systems approach or if I want to work independently. I want control as in a traditional classroom." "I would probably attempt to design much of the course myself, but would value the experience and insight of others." "I would prefer consulting with faculty and course designers and working on my own to deliver courses. I would want help, but not be forced to rely upon it." "I prefer to be master of my own ship." "I prefer to be solely responsible for delivery and design. I am better doing this by myself, though I will still need training." "I would like technical help, but decide myself on the content of the course."

Section VI - Faculty Rewards

Distance Faculty's, Classroom Faculty's and Division Chairs' Attitudes towards Rewards for Participation in Distance Education

Table 12 displays the results when all survey respondents were asked if distance faculty should or should not be rewarded differently for their participation in distance education.

Table 12

Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "Should Faculty be Rewarded Differently for their Participation in Distance Education

Faculty Type	Different rewards for Distance Education Yes	Different rewards for Distance Education No	Different rewards for Distance Education Not Sure
All Distance faculty	51%	37%	
Distance Faculty who teach only distance courses	43%	43%	14%
Classroom faculty	33%	45%	6%
Division Chairs	46%	39%	

Distance Faculty's, Classroom Faculty's and Division Chairs' Attitudes toward Faculty Rewards for Participation in Training for Distance Education

Table 13 displays the results when all survey respondents were asked if distance faculty should be rewarded by release time or stipend or not rewarded at all for participating in distance education training.

Table 13

Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "How Faculty Should be Rewarded for their Participation in Distance Education Training

Faculty Type	Release Time	Stipend	Neither Stipend or Release time	Either Stipend or Release Time	Both Stipend and Release time
All Distance faculty	29%	12%	18%	4%	22%

Table 13 – cont.

Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question

"How Faculty Should be Rewarded for their Participation in Distance Education Training

Faculty Type	Release Time	Stipend	Neither Stipend or Release time	Either Stipend or Release Time	Both Stipend and Release time
Distance faculty who only teach distance courses	29%	0%	0%	29%	14%
Classroom Faculty	27%	8%	22%	1%	15%
Division Chairs	8%	8%	39%	15%	15%

Distance Faculty's, Classroom Faculty's and Division Chairs' Attitudes toward Faculty Rewards for Developing Distance Education Courses

Table 14 displays the results when all survey respondents were asked if distance faculty should be rewarded by release time or stipend or not rewarded at all for developing distance courses.

Table 14

Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question

"How Faculty Should be Rewarded for Developing Distance Education Courses

Faculty Type	Release Time for course development	Stipend for course development	Neither Stipend or Release time for course development	Either Stipend or Release Time for course development	Both Stipend and Release time for course development
All Distance faculty	37%	12%	4%	4%	39%

Table 14 – cont.

Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question "How Faculty Should be Rewarded for Developing Distance Education Courses

Faculty Type	**Release Time for course development**	**Stipend for course development**	**Neither Stipend or Release time for course development**	**Either Stipend or Release Time for course development**	**Both Stipend and Release time for course development**
Distance faculty who only teach distance courses	14%	0%	0%	14%	57%
Classroom Faculty	35%	8%	10%	1%	24%
Division Chairs	39%	8%	8%	15.5%	31%

Classroom faculty who believed that distance faculty should be rewarded differently for participating in distance education based their decision upon the extra work involved in distance education (i.e., the time they take to respond to students' emails, training, course design and development and updating of materials). "Yes, distance faculty should be rewarded differently, based upon how many students they support." "Based upon the amount of students equals increased work should equal increased pay." Distance faculty should be rewarded differently if the in-put for distance courses is more." "Distance education is more time intensive in many ways – training development, managing the technology and troubleshooting." Only one faculty member voiced concern over intellectual property rights – "If course development includes development of media (like textbook) faculty should reap some long term benefit. Especially if sold!"

A large percentage of classroom faculty voiced a concern that all faculty should receive the same rewards regardless of how their courses are delivered. "Course development is course development. It all takes time for new and novel approaches or new courses." "A course is a course and all have different demands." "I don't believe that community college faculty should be rewarded differently as they are both teaching – one isn't necessarily better or more complicated than the other. Distance faculty should receive comp time." "Both modes of delivery are difficult to do, so they shouldn't be rewarded differently." "People should be rewarded regardless of their approach. Rewards should be based upon results not methods or approach." "Distance faculty shouldn't be rewarded differently. Teaching is a person to person thing, not a person to machine thing." "Distance faculty shouldn't be rewarded differently. Just because someone teaches in this environment doesn't mean they are working harder, doing more, being more effective, etc. than someone teaching in traditional ways and using technology, i.e., power point presentations."

Other classroom faculty thought that delivery method should not automatically dictate a reward. "Teaching is teaching – different techniques aren't what we should reward. You should reward for a job well done – not the technical alone." Some faculty perceived that faculty rewards should continue to be based on how many full time enrollees (FTE) they produce, regardless of how much time and effort they devote to distance courses. "Much more work involved continued time in interaction that is not reflective of FTEs." While still others believe that rewards should be based upon the quality of the instruction. "This is a case by case decision – need to know what distance education means, showing videos or detailed interaction with the individual." One faculty member believed that compensation for distance education should be less than the amount classroom faculty receive. "I think they should be paid less. It's not nearly as difficult. I don't get anything for learning new material and developing new courses."

Distance faculty preferred non-synchronous or a mix of synchronous and non-synchronous more widely than they preferred complete synchronous delivery. The vast majority of distance faculty favored the provision of release time for training and course development and justified this rationale by the increased workload they encounter as a result of teaching via distance. "Distance faculty should be granted release time as distance education is more time consuming to design and deliver." " Faculty who participate in distance education should be rewarded differently for the time to develop course materials necessary to learn the software and there should be a decrease in class size since distance learning requires more individual attention and contact with each student." "There are just different forms of education. The time demanded for preparation has to be considered for distance education." "Faculty should be rewarded for course design and development because of the long learning curve for web design and the time spent developing it."

Other distance faculty expressed concern about the number of courses and students in each class that constitutes an equitable workload for distance faculty. " Student cap at twenty and thereafter an overload ratio." "The intensive nature of one to one intervention with students must be considered in calculating reasonable workloads." "Classes should be smaller. Distance education is a labor intensive way of teaching –

amounts to one to one with many students." "Yes, distance faculty should receive rewards at certain levels of enrollment." "The College needs to take into account the number of students in an on-line course and reward accordingly."

A small percentage of distance faculty agreed with their colleagues who teach classroom courses that faculty who teach classroom courses and those who teach distance courses should receive the same rewards. "Distance faculty should not be rewarded differently as we all have the same teaching load." "Distance education should be regarded as another method, not better or worse." "If they keep the teaching load the same for traditional classes, I don't think faculty should have any special rewards." "No, distance faculty should not receive different rewards. It's similar to classroom teaching."

The majority of division chairs replied that distance faculty should receive some type of reward for their participation in distance education, but should not be rewarded for participating in distance education training. Two division chairs believed that distance faculty should be given a choice of release time or stipend. One chair reasoned that "stipend or release time are incentives for them to learn a new method of instruction." One chair thought that faculty should be rewarded differently, but only to design distance courses. Another division chair though that faculty should be rewarded differently due to the increased workload and added that a reduced teaching load and release time for development should also be given. Two division chairs explicitly stated that their distance faculty should not receive different rewards. One chair reasoned that both classroom and distance faculty have equal teaching loads while the other claimed that we should not be rewarding faculty but should spend our time trying to recruit faculty who want to teach via distance."

Distance faculty also believed that quality distance courses should be directly related to compensation. " I believe that the more important issue regarding compensation deals with the quality and student enrollment." Some distance faculty perceived their loads and roles as educators to be the same as their colleagues who teach in traditional classrooms and therefore their rewards should be the same as well.

Section VII Distance Education and the Community College

The Relationship between Distance Education and the Mission of the Community College

The vast majority of responses to this questions revealed that faculty and division chairs perceive distance education as contributing to the teaching portion of the community college mission. The responses are outlined in Table 15 below in greater detail.

Table 15

Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs' Responses to the Question, "How Does Distance Education best fit the Categories of Teaching, Research or Service?"

Faculty Type	**Teaching**	**Research**	**Service**	**Teaching, Research & Service**	**Teaching & Service**	**Teaching & Research**	**Not Sure**
Distance Faculty	65%	0%	2%	2%	20%	4%	2%
Distance Faculty who only distance courses	57%	0%	0%	29%	0%	0%	0%
Classroom Faculty	44%	3%	13%	6%	14%	4%	3%
Division Chairs	62%	0%	0%	0%	31%	8%	0%

Faculty and division chairs were also asked to what extent their community college was willing to commit its mission and budgetary resources to make distance education more successful (successful was defined as increased enrollments, increased retention of distance students, increased faculty participation, increased faculty support and rewards for participation in distance education and increased retention of distance faculty).

Fifty percent of the classroom faculty responded to this question. Of those who responded, at least 25% of the classroom faculty were not sure of the college's commitment to distance education. The other twenty-five percent who replied to the question assessed the College's commitment to distance education to be between the range of very committed and somewhat committed.

Classroom faculty also questioned what their community college's goals were in relation to its mission and distance education. "Unsure of the goal. Is it to increase the number of distance courses or to increase learning by students who cannot otherwise be served?" "The College has no choice but to commit in all areas. This is a future trend." The College is supportive, but not at the expense of regular classes." "To achieve the budgetary resources you have outlined in your question a comprehensive distance education program must be put in place campus wide. It does not currently exist. Presently some campuses, disciplines, courses and professors are given preferences and support." " The college seems most anxious to commit its resources to distance learning." " Commitment will be the story if evidence of success is available." "If enrollments go up, 100% committed. If enrollments go down 0% committed." A few faculty expressed more pessimistic views. " College seems willing. Government is not." "The state community college system as a whole is not seriously committed to distance education. Equipment yes, compensation no."

Distance faculty's assessment of the College's commitment to distance education seemed to be strong, but they questioned the availability of institutional and state resources. "The College is very willing, but the budget is not here to support us." "The College has had a distance education program for twenty years. It receives support." "Very high, the college fully supports distance education." "So far not a lot. Release time and/or stipends are limited but this college is better than most." " College is somewhat willing to commit to DE. The class sizes need to be smaller." "Very little support except through grants." " Lack of state support for teaching compensation no matter whether it's traditional or distance learning." "Currently the college has limited opportunity for instructors to teach on-line."

Division chairs were evenly divided over the degree of support that the College is willing to provide for distance education. Three division chairs perceived the College as being very supportive of efforts for continued development of distance education, as is witnessed by their comments "The College is willing to commit a great deal as is witnessed by the budget." " I think there are resources available for improving and expanding distance education." Two chairs underscored that the college is committed to distance education, but questioned if it has budgetary support. "I believe that the College is willing to commit its mission this endeavor but does not have the resources to commit significant budgetary resources." Two chairs questioned the college's commitment. "They want the enrollment, but do not want to support with resources." "Very little support. An important question is: should the community college take funds from traditional programs to develop distance courses?"

Section VIII: Motivating Factors

Factors that would Motivate Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs to Participate in Distance Education

All classroom faculty, distance faculty and division chairs were given a list of thirty factors which they were asked to rate on a five point Likert scale (1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree and 5 strongly agree) the extent to which these factors do, or would influence them to continue or begin participating in distance education. The researcher calculated the means of distance and classroom faculty responses to which factors would motivate faculty to participate in distance education. Table 16-A displays the results of this information.

The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	More flexible working conditions	5.0
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Intellectual challenge of distance education	4.71
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Ability to reach new audiences who can't attend campus based classes	4.57
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses	4.43
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Personal motivation to use technology	4.29

Table 16-A Cont.

The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Opportunity to teach a course in an "a-synchronous environment"	4.29
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Opportunity to work with course designers, distance education instructors and technologists to develop and deliver distance courses.	4.14
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Opportunity to improve classroom teaching through distance education participation	3.86
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Opportunity to diversify program offerings	3.71
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Extent to which distance education would provide opportunities for career exploration and expansion.	3.71
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Receiving a stipend for distance education participation	3.57
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Technical, administrative and clerical support	3.57
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider to a facilitator	3.57
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Increase in salary	3.43
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Recognition and rewards from college	3.4
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Support from division chair	3.43
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Strengthened job security	3.29

Table 16-A Cont.

The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Release time	3.14
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Reduced Teaching load	3.14
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Provision of distance training by the college	3.14
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Support from departmental colleagues	3.00
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Protection of Intellectual Property Rights	3.00
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Royalties from Intellectual Property Rights	2.86
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Credit toward promotion and tenure	2.71
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Grants for materials and expenses	2.71
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Creating a support system to retain distance faculty	2.29
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Merit Pay	2.14
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Opportunity to teach a course in a synchronous environment	2.0
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Visibility for jobs at other colleges and universities	1.86
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	College expectation that faculty participate in distance education	1.86

Table 16-B

The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Distance Faculty	More flexible working conditions	4.22
Distance Faculty	Personal Motivation to use technology	3.98
Distance Faculty	Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses	3.96
Distance Faculty	Intellectual challenge of distance education	3.82
Distance Faculty	Ability to reach new audiences who can't attend campus based classes	3.79
Distance Faculty	Credit toward promotion and tenure	3.74
Distance Faculty	Release time	3.64
Distance Faculty	Support from Division Chair	3.49
Distance Faculty	Extent to which distance education would provide opportunities for career exploration and expansion	3.48
Distance Faculty	Increase in salary	3.47
Distance Faculty	Receiving Stipend for distance education participation	3.47
Distance Faculty	Opportunity to improve classroom teaching through distance education participation	3.47
Distance Faculty	Opportunity to diversify program offerings	3.40
Distance Faculty	Technical, administrative and clerical support	3.37
Distance Faculty	Reduced Teaching Load	3.33
Distance Faculty	Grants for materials and expenses	3.31
Distance Faculty	Merit Pay	3.29
Distance Faculty	Strengthened job security	3.25
Distance Faculty	Opportunity to work with course designers, distance education instructors and technologists to develop and deliver distance courses.	3.23
Distance Faculty	Protection of Intellectual Property Rights	3.22
Distance Faculty	Recognition and rewards from college	3.18
Distance Faculty	Royalties on copyrighted materials	3.15
Distance Faculty	Provision of distance training by the college	3.14
Distance Faculty	Support from department colleagues	3.12
Distance Faculty	Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider to a facilitator	3.02

Table 16-B - Cont.

The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Distance Faculty	Visibility for jobs at other colleges and universities	2.94
Distance Faculty	Creating support systems to retain distance faculty	2.89
Distance Faculty	College expectation that faculty participate in distance education.	2.88
Distance Faculty	Opportunity to teach a distance course in an a-synchronous environment	2.85
Distance Faculty	Opportunity to teach a distance course in a synchronous environment	2.74

Table 16-C

The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Classroom Faculty	Increase in salary	3.59
Classroom Faculty	Ability to reach new audiences who can't attend campus based classes	3.59
Classroom Faculty	More flexible working conditions	3.57
Classroom Faculty	Receiving a stipend for distance education participation	3.48
Classroom Faculty	Motivation to use Technology	3.47
Classroom Faculty	Release time	3.41
Classroom Faculty	Opportunity to improve classroom teaching through distance education participation	3.41
Classroom Faculty	Provision of distance training by the college	3.31
Classroom	Merit Pay	3.30
Classroom Faculty	Technical, administrative and clerical support	3.37
Classroom Faculty	Intellectual challenge of distance education	3.39
Classroom Faculty	Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses	3.39
Classroom Faculty	Reduced Teaching Load	3.35

Table 16-C Cont.

The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Classroom Faculty	Support from Division Chair	3.35
Classroom Faculty	Grants for materials and expenses	3.23
Classroom Faculty	Opportunity to diversify program offerings	3.22
Classroom Faculty	Strengthened job security	3.15
Classroom Faculty	Credit toward promotion and tenure	3.15
Classroom Faculty	Protection of Intellectual Property Rights	3.14
Classroom Faculty	Royalties on copyrighted materials	3.10
Classroom Faculty	Recognition and rewards from college	3.07
Classroom Faculty	Extent to which distance education would provide opportunities for career exploration and expansion	3.05
Classroom Faculty	Opportunity to work with course designers, distance education instructors and technologists to develop and deliver distance courses.	3.04
Classroom Faculty	Support from department colleagues	2.99
Classroom Faculty	Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider to a facilitator	2.86
Classroom Faculty	Opportunity to teach a distance course in a synchronous environment	2.78
Classroom Faculty	Creating support systems to retain distance faculty	2.76
Classroom Faculty	College expectation that faculty participate in distance education.	2.71
Classroom Faculty	Visibility for jobs at other colleges and universities	2.65
Classroom Faculty	Opportunity to teach a distance course in an a-synchronous environment	2.58

Table 16-D

The Means of the Responses from Division Chairs to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Division Chairs	Receiving a stipend for distance education participation	4.54
Division Chairs	Increase in salary	4.46
Division Chairs	Personal Motivation to use technology	4.23
Division Chairs	More flexible working conditions	4.15
Division Chairs	Grants for materials and expenses	4.08
Division Chairs	Support from Division Chair	4.08
Division Chairs	Ability to reach new audiences who can't attend campus based classes	3.92
Division Chairs	Technical, administrative and clerical support	3.92
Division Chairs	Release time	3.92
Division Chairs	Provision of distance training by the college	3.85
Division Chairs	Intellectual challenge of distance education	3.77
Division Chairs	Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses	3.77
Division Chairs	Support from department colleagues	3.62
Division Chairs	Royalties on copyrighted materials	3.54
Division Chairs	Reduced Teaching Load	3.54
Division Chairs	Merit Pay	3.46
Division Chairs	Opportunity to diversify program offerings	3.46
Division Chairs	Opportunity to improve classroom teaching through distance education participation	3.46
Division Chairs	Recognition and rewards from college	3.46
Division Chairs	Protection of Intellectual Property Rights	3.38
Division Chairs	Strengthened job security	3.31
Division Chairs	Credit toward promotion and tenure	3.23
Division Chairs	Opportunity to work with course designers, distance education instructors and technologists to develop and deliver distance courses.	3.23
Division Chairs	Visibility for jobs at other colleges and universities	3.15
Division Chairs	Extent to which distance education would provide opportunities for career exploration and expansion	3.08
Division Chairs	Opportunity to teach a distance course in an a-synchronous environment	3.08

Table 16-D Cont.

The Means of the Responses from Division Chairs to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Motivate You to Participate in Distance Education."

Sample	Motivating Factors	Means
Division Chairs	College expectation that faculty participate in distance education.	3.00
Division Chairs	Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider to being a facilitator	2.92
Division Chairs	Creating support systems to retain distance faculty	2.92
Division Chairs	Opportunity to teach a distance course in a synchronous environment	2.62

Some classroom faculty comments focused upon a combination of release time, stipends and training as being the best motivators for faculty to teach distance courses. "Provide training, provide rewards from participating in training and provide release time for course development." "My biggest issue is not enough release time granted for things like this – that would make it more worthwhile." "Provide strong financial incentives, adequate time and appropriate technology." " Extra time beyond the normal workload is needed. For me, I really think there are so many different functions that a teacher serves as which means teachers are already spread thin across their duties."

Other classroom faculty remarks centered on the idea of attracting faculty who want to teach via distance education. "If someone doesn't want to [participate in distance education], then they shouldn't and the College shouldn't make them." "Increase incentives especially for younger faculty." " First of all bend your efforts toward those professors enamored with technology and don't waste your efforts on the people who enjoy the natural world. Then pay them well, acknowledge their creativity and value to the institution. Praise them in front of other teachers, etc." "Help find the proper target audiences." "Hire people who like that type of impersonal teaching." " What need exists can be met by interested colleagues!"

Some classroom faculty also said that demonstrating the quality of distance courses could serve as a strong source of motivation for faculty to participate in distance education. " Show it to be better than the classroom." "Provide feedback to distance faculty concerning students success rate at higher levels." "Convince them that there's a real need for it, aside from money; provide compensation of some sort for the work involved." "Convince faculty that distance educationally sound and pay faculty commensurate with compensation paid by the private sector." "Have assessments that demonstrate how students learn differently, if they do."

A small number of classroom faculty commented upon the need for distance faculty to receive support from mentors and colleagues. "Provide release time and encouragement." "Support their efforts, provide mentors." " Perhaps a cluster of faculty mentors, who, for one semester could work with other faculty on distance education projects. Give these mentors release time and hire adjuncts to meet the mentors' and distance faculty's classroom requirements."

Distance faculty more strongly supported rewards, release time, stipends and training, coupled with a reasonable course load for faculty who are engaged in distance learning. "Decrease office hours, good training, stipends to develop courses." "Pay them properly for the student work load. Actually my community college already does that!" "Money or adjusted work hours." "Release time to develop and update courses and lower enrollments." "Need to compensate for extra time required." "Provide training, a systems approach and proper rewards."

In addition to an expressed need for monetary or time compensation, distance faculty also conveyed a need for recognition of the contributions they are making to student learning and a freedom to develop new methods of distance teaching. " Explore different courses that could be offered as distance learning. Encourage faculty to use technology." "Encourage more freedom to experiment with methodology." "Emphasize the benefits to students who can't attend campus courses. Also recognize the work of faculty who do participate. We are often made to feel as though we are not actually working because we may not be on campus as much. However, the work never ends." "More support and rewards and encouragement and appreciation and recognition." "Provide more encouragement and incentives."

Distance faculty also expressed a need to cap enrollments of large classes, count small classes as a full class (sometimes distance classes allow faculty to consolidate small sections at each of the five campuses into one course), and achieve a balance of campus and distance office hours. "Support development. Count small enrollment as full course if unique student opportunities are provided." "Smaller class sizes and flexibility with campus office hours." Another area about which faculty expressed concern is the rolling admission policy which allows students to begin distance courses at any time. " Do away with rolling admissions."

Lastly, a few distance faculty underscored the need for support and commitment to distance education. "Solid infrastructure and great support" "The college must continue to offer the opportunity and the necessary technological support." "Provide back to industry training, and more technical and administrative support." Only one distance faculty member expressed concern about the lack of retaining intellectual property rights.

Five division chairs thought that release time for course development would be the most appropriate type of reward for distance faculty. Two division chairs commented that distance faculty should be given access to support staff, training, have a decrease in work load and be given stipends to develop courses. One division chair was uncommitted and another did not at all support any different rewards for distance faculty. When division chairs were asked to provide a rationale for why they did or didn't provide release time, they explained that faculty must apply directly to the College for release time.

When classroom faculty were asked if their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education would be affected by different rewards, at least a third said that rewards wouldn't influence their decision not to engage in distance learning. "No change, I still prefer to lecture to live people." "Not relevant in this point of my career." "Rewards have nothing to do with my teaching philosophy." "At my stage in life I want to do research in the typical plankton. I want to work with scientific peers and publish my results. I want to travel and explore. I don't want to sit in front of an electronic box for endless hours." "Interest (lack of) is the issue- not rewards."

Another third of classroom faculty replied that rewards would have some effect upon their decision to participate in distance education. "I would definitely do it for release time." " I think a proactive approach of granting reassigned time would encourage me." "Unless they were huge rewards, no difference." "Time and money would be a factor." "More rewards available equals more willingness to participate." "It may affect my decision but it doesn't weigh heavily." "If I were to receive release time for developing a course, I might consider becoming more of a distance education participant." "If I would be more motivated if I had release time to work on it." "Of course it would be affected positively to some extent, but I'm not sure it's a positive direction for my discipline (English as a second language)." "Money talks." The remaining classroom faculty responded that their participation in distance education would depend on what constituted rewards.

When distance faculty were asked if additional rewards would affect their decision to continue their participation in distance education only twenty percent replied that rewards would have no effect on their involvement in distance learning. "It would not matter. I love distance education and classroom teaching." "Since it wasn't my idea to do it, the rewards wouldn't make much difference." "I'm already motivated to continue with distance education so new rewards would not change my attitude." "For me I have other motivations to participate."

The remaining distance faculty replied that rewards would only have a positive effect on their continued participation. " Icing on the cake!" "I could improve the quality and go nation wide." "Rewards would increase my interest and number of courses offered." "Perhaps I would increase my load, although I am favorable to distance and active now." "I have done it without compensation – there is much extra time involved (training, preparing, sending, receiving materials, communicating with students and technical people). I would be more positive if compensated." "I would strengthen my decision to participate." "It depends on the rewards – the greater the rewards, the more positive the feelings, but already involved." "If there were more positive rewards available, I would be more inclined to participate." "More likely to design new distance courses."

Division chairs were equally divided on the effect rewards would have upon their decision to participate in distance education. Half of the chairs replied that it would have a positive effect, while the other half said that rewards would not have any effect upon their involvement in distance learning.

The Impact of the Faculty Role Changing from a Knowledge Provider to a Facilitator

The survey provided the following definition of a facilitator "A facilitator enables students to interact with course content, learn from classmates and become active participants in their own learning," (Moore and Kearsley, 1996). Respondents were asked to indicate if the paradigm shift from being a teacher who gives expert knowledge to being a facilitator has impacted their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education.

Twenty-five percent of the classroom faculty responded that the change from teacher to facilitator had no effect upon their decision not to participate in distance education, as they all considered themselves to be facilitators in their classroom courses. "Not at all the classroom requires that I play a facilitator most of the time." "I am a facilitator and an expert now I would not expect that to change." "As a foreign language teacher I am already as much a facilitator as an expert. Doesn't impact my decision much. " I am a facilitator in my classroom! My students are active participants in their own learning. Doesn't everyone do that in their classroom?" "This aspect of distance education has no impact on my decision." "In my health technology role, I have always been a facilitator – I think this shift does not impact me at all." "Silly concept – all teachers are facilitators no matter how you frame it." "I like this paradigm. I use it here and have no interest in distance learning."

Some classroom faculty took issue with the definition of a facilitator that the researcher quoted from Moore and Kearsley (1996). "I think your idea of a teacher is inconsistent with mine. Your teacher sounds like a lecturer." " I think this is a loaded question. I disagree with your definitions of a classroom teacher." " I think the teacher is a facilitator in the classroom! (unless they are boring dull lecturers). I totally disagree with the whole concept of the above definition of a facilitator and I am by far not certain that distance learning makes the one who delivers it a facilitator! The theory assumes quite a lot."

Three classroom faculty questioned whether the community college was an appropriate environment to conduct classes as a facilitator rather than as a teacher. "You have to have students who are responsible adult learners!" " Students are learning to be more active in their learning process and I see this as a plus *for those who can handle it."* " Most of the students we teach here are helped by a teacher and not by a facilitator."

A number of classroom faculty also questioned if distance education provided an environment where facilitation could take place. " In a synchronous classroom I felt less able to facilitate as I could not use the group discussion as well." " This is what I do. What I've always done. It's also what suffers with distance education." "I view myself as a facilitator and firmly believe that the classroom offers the best environment for that style." "A lot depends on the course the instructor is teaching. Some courses are better with facilitators, others with a teacher."

Over half of the distance faculty who responded to this question replied that the shift from teacher to facilitator did not have any effect upon their decision to participate in distance education. Like their colleagues who teach classroom courses, distance faculty view themselves as facilitators in both teaching environments. "I have never seen myself as a "teacher" who gives away expert knowledge in the classroom. This kind of misunderstanding drives me away." "Knowledge needs to be a shared experience." "In both the classroom and in distance courses there is a constant interplay between these two roles of teacher and facilitator." "I'm not a control freak and enjoy participation in traditional class and enjoy the role of the facilitator." "I look at myself as a 'learning guide' – I come up with ways that students can learn."

The majority of distance faculty replied that they preferred being facilitators rather than teachers, as they felt facilitation resulted in students becoming more engaged in their own learning. " It took awhile for me to adapt to this shift, but now I find it to be a better way of learning for the students. In a traditional classroom the students don't have to do research and work out the concepts they don't understand because the teacher is there ready to answer the questions. In distance learning the students have to spend more time figuring out the concepts on their own and when they do, I believe true learning has occurred." "Students are better prepared when they own their education." "It improves learning!" Although most of the faculty embraced the role a facilitator, one faculty urged caution in using it with students at the community college. "It all depends on the type of learners. The instructor must keep in mind that this mode of learning is not for all. The instructor will mostly likely not reach all."

All of the division chairs except for one replied that the shift from teacher to facilitator had not in any way impacted their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education. One division chair did caution that distance courses are not appropriate for every learning style. "Learning styles obviously vary among students. Not all students benefit from this delivery mode. I would not want to offer all classes in this format."

Section IV - Inhibiting Factors

Factors that Inhibit Distance Faculty, Classroom Faculty and Division Chairs from Participating in Distance Education

All classroom faculty, distance faculty and division chairs were given a list of thirty factors which they were asked to rate on a five point Likert scale (1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 agree and 5 strongly agree) the extent to which these factors do, or would deter them from participating in distance education. The higher the means, the higher the level of agreement that the factor heavily influenced respondents and the lower the mean, the stronger the disagreement that the factor had any influence on respondents' decisions. The researcher calculated the means of distance faculty and classroom faculty's responses to which factors would inhibit faculty to participate in distance education. Table 17 displays the results of this information.

Table 17-A

The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of monetary support (i.e. stipend)	3.57
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Concern about faculty workload	3.57
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of salary increase	3.43
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of technological background	3.14
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of administrative, technical or clerical support	3.14
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Concern about the quality of students who enroll in distance courses	2.14
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	A dislike for the collaborative nature of distance program design and delivery	3.0
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of credit toward promotion and tenure	3.0
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of distance education training provided by the college	3.0
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of release time	2.86
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Teaching a course in a synchronous environment	2.71
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of support from departmental colleagues	2.43
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of recognition and rewards	2.29

Table 17 –A Cont.

The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of royalties on copyrighted materials	2.29
Distance Faculty	Lack of grants or materials for expenses	2.29
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Teaching a course in an a-synchronous environment	2.17
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Concern about quality of courses	2.14
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Change in faculty role from a knowledge provider to a facilitator	2.0
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of support from division chair	2.0
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of Merit Pay	1.86
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	Lack of professional prestige	1.86
Distance Faculty who only teach distance courses	A sense of a loss of control over the teaching and learning process	1.86

Table 17-B

The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "to what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Distance Faculty	Concern about Faculty Workload	3.92
Distance Faculty	Lack of release time	3.59
Distance Faculty	Lack of salary increase	3.39

Distance Faculty	Lack of monetary support (i.e., stipend)	3.35

Table 17-B Cont.

The Means of the Responses from Distance Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Distance Faculty	Lack of administrative, technical or clerical support	3.16
Distance Faculty	Lack of recognition or rewards	3.16
Distance Faculty	Lack of support from departmental colleagues	3.12
Distance Faculty	Lack of support from division chair	3.12
Distance Faculty	Lack of technological background	3.12
Distance Faculty	Lack of credit toward promotion or tenure	3.06
Distance Faculty	Lack of distance education training provided by the college	3.04
Distance Faculty	Concern about quality of courses	2.94
Distance Faculty	Concern about the quality of students	2.90
Distance Faculty	Lack of grants or materials for expenses	2.86
Distance Faculty	Lack of Merit Pay	2.84
Distance Faculty	Change in faculty role from a knowledge provider to a facilitator	2.80
Distance Faculty	Lack of professional prestige	2.76
Distance Faculty	Lack of royalties on copyrighted materials	2.76
Distance Faculty	A dislike for the collaborative nature of distance program design and delivery	2.67
Distance Faculty	A sense of a loss of control over the teaching and learning process	2.65
Distance Faculty	Teaching in a distance course in a synchronous environment	2.61
Distance Faculty	Teaching a distance course in an a-synchronous environment	2.58

Table 17C

The Means of the Responses from Classroom Faculty to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Classroom Faculty	Concern about quality of courses	3.75
Classroom Faculty	Concern about Faculty Workload	3.74
Classroom Faculty	Lack of release time	3.54
Classroom Faculty	Lack of Merit Pay	3.30
Classroom Faculty	Lack of monetary support (i.e., stipend)	3.27
Classroom Faculty	Lack of administrative, technical or clerical support	3.18
Classroom Faculty	Lack of royalties on copyrighted materials	3.10
Classroom Faculty	A sense of a loss of control over the teaching and learning process	3.09
Classroom Faculty	Lack of grants or materials for expenses	3.03
Classroom Faculty	Lack of salary increase	3.02
Classroom Faculty	Lack of distance education training provided by the college	2.97
Classroom Faculty	Concern about the quality of students	2.96
Classroom Faculty	Lack of technological background	2.92
Classroom Faculty	Lack of credit toward promotion or tenure	2.74
Classroom Faculty	Lack of recognition or rewards	2.72
Classroom Faculty	Lack of support from departmental colleagues	2.66
Classroom Faculty	A dislike for the collaborative nature of distance program design and delivery	2.66
Classroom Faculty	Change in faculty role from a knowledge provider to a facilitator	2.59
Classroom Faculty	Lack of professional prestige	2.58
Classroom Faculty	Lack of support from division chair	2.56
Classroom Faculty	Teaching a distance course in an a-synchronous environment	2.52
Classroom Faculty	Teaching in a distance course in a synchronous environment	2.35

Table 17D

The Means of the Responses from Division Chairs to the Question, "To what Degree do these Factors Inhibit you from Participating in Distance Education."

Sample	Inhibiting Factors	Means
Division Chairs	Concern about Faculty Workload	3.92
Division Chairs	Lack of release time	3.62
Division Chairs	Lack of monetary support (i.e., stipend)	3.54
Division Chairs	Lack of administrative, technical or clerical support	3.38
Division Chairs	Lack of salary increase	3.15
Division Chairs	Concern about quality of courses	3.15
Division Chairs	Lack of grants or materials for expenses	3.08
Division Chairs	Lack of royalties on copyrighted materials	3.00
Division Chairs	Lack of technological background	3.00
Division Chairs	Lack of technological background	3.00
Division Chairs	Lack of credit toward promotion or tenure	3.00
Division Chairs	Lack of Merit Pay	2.92
Division Chairs	Lack of distance education training provided by the college	2.85
Division Chairs	Lack of support from departmental colleagues	2.77
Division Chairs	Teaching in a distance course in a synchronous environment	2.77
Division Chairs	Lack of recognition or rewards	2.77
Division Chairs	Lack of support from division chair	2.69
Division Chairs	Concern about the quality of students	2.69
Division Chairs	Lack of professional prestige	2.62
Division Chairs	A dislike for the collaborative nature of distance program design and delivery	2.54
Division Chairs	A sense of a loss of control over the teaching and learning process	2.46
Division Chairs	Change in faculty role from a knowledge provider to a facilitator	2.46
Division Chairs	Teaching a distance course in an a-synchronous environment	2.38

Section X - Distance Faculty's, Classroom Faculty's and Division Chairs' Attitudes Toward Distance Education

Distance faculty and division chairs' attitudes towards distance education appeared to be overwhelming positive, while classroom faculty's attitudes towards distance education appeared to be more neutral, and leaning toward positive perceptions. Table 18 displays this information.

Table 18

The Means of the Responses from Distance Only Faculty, Distance Faculty and Division Chairs to the Question "What is your Attitude Toward Distance Education?"

Sample	**Positive Attitude toward Distance Education**	**Negative Attitude toward Distance Education**	**Neutral Attitude toward Distance Education**
All Distance Faculty	86%	4%	8%
Distance faculty who only teach distance courses	86%	14%	0%
Classroom Faculty	33%	20%	42%
Division Chairs	69%	0%	23%

Section XI - Participation in Distance Education

The Number of Distance Faculty by Campus and Division who Teach via Distance Education

Division chairs and the data from the College's Office of Institutional Research revealed that there are seventy-three faculty who taught distance education courses during the 2001 fall semester when the survey for this dissertation was conducted. This number of seventy-three faculty equate to an average of 15 distance faculty on each campus, or a mean of 5 per division on each campus. Table 19 displays the actual number of distance faculty who teach in each division across the five campuses.

Table 19

The Number of Faculty who Teach Distance Courses by Division and Campus and the Student Enrollment Headcount at Each Campus.

Divisions	**Campus I Number of Distance Faculty** **Campus headcount for fall 2001: 10,418**	**Campus II Number of Distance Faculty** **Campus headcount for fall 2001: 14,257**	**Campus III Number of Distance Faculty** **Campus headcount for fall 2001: 4, 916**	**Campus IV Number of Distance Faculty** **Campus headcount for fall 2001: 3,948**	**Campus V Number of Distance Faculty** **Campus headcount for fall 2001: 5,599**
Liberal Arts Division	3	16	2	2	10
Math & Science Division	1	11	1	0	0
Business & Technology	3	12	0	0	7
Health Technologies Division	0	4	0	0	0
Visual and Performing Arts Division	0	0	0	0	0
Total Number by campus of faculty who teach distance courses:	7	43	3	3	17

Table 20 provides a list of the number of distance faculty by division and campus who have designed courses.

Table 20

The Number of Faculty who Design Distance Courses by Division and Campus

Divisions	Campus I	Campus II	Campus III	Campus IV	Campus V
Liberal Arts Division	0	6	0	2	0
Math and Science Division	0	10	2	1	2
Business and Technologies Division	3	5	0	0	0
Health Technologies Division	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Language and Literatures	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Number of Faculty who Design distance course at each campus:	3	25	2	3	2

Table 21 provides a the number of distance courses that the community college offers on each division and campus.

Table 21

The Number of distance courses offered by Division at each of the Five Campuses

Divisions	Campus I	Campus II	Campus III	Campus IV	Campus V
Liberal Arts Division	15	15	12	3	16
Math/Science Division	2	20	0	0	0
Business & Technologies Division	2	18	0	0	22

Table 21 – cont.

The Number of distance courses offered by Division at each of the Five Campuses

Divisions	Campus I	Campus II	Campus III	Campus IV	Campus V
Health Technologies Division	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Language and Literatures	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Distance Courses offered at each Campus:	19	69	12	3	38

Table 22 provides the total number of distance courses that are offered in each division at the community college.

Table 22

The Total Number of Distance Courses offered at the Community College by Division

Academic Divisions	Total Number of Distance Courses offered at all five campuses by division:
Liberal Arts	73
Math/Science/Engineering	22
Business & technologies	42
Health Technologies	4
Total Number of Distance Courses offered:	141

Section XII - General Comments about Distance Education

The last part of the survey asked faculty and division chairs to share any thoughts they had about distance education. Classroom faculty's comments focused upon their concerns regarding the quality of distance education courses, and its appropriateness for the community college student population and certain academic disciplines. "I think the courses are not nearly as challenging as face to face. I think we are cheapening our degree." "You need personal live communication – nothing can fully replace that. Technology can only supplement. The heart of teaching is in the classroom." "Distance education is like a textbook. There are many good textbooks in my field so why write one unless I have too much time on my hands." "There is a huge difference between intuitive and technical courses. For many reasons the largest hurdle to over come for technical courses is the sense of isolation in the course. In technical courses this is demonstrating. Not only must technology be available for the teacher to student and student to teacher, but perhaps as importantly it should be open for student to student."

Classroom faculty also expressed concerns about the lack of rewards for distance education, plagiarism and cheating and how well it would benefit students at the community college. "There are in my opinion several serious problems with distance education. These problems center around two issues: lack of realistic monetary support and student security/honesty/capability. The college poorly compensates us as it is and using distance techniques, which requires all sorts of extra efforts is currently not seen as meriting appropriate compensation. I am also very concerned about the students. Our students have a hard time figuring out that they should bring pens and paper to class. They cheat under our noses. I see no way to make certain that the student signed up for the course is actually the (only) one taking the course. I am teaching internet use in my classes currently and my students appreciate this introduction, but are struggling. I believe that most would have great difficulty following a distance education process. There certainly are some students who would find this sort of option useful and valuable and who would be able to understand use the processes, but I believe that at this time, it is a minority."

Distance faculty also noted that they have encountered problems with the policy of rolling admission or continuous enrollment that allows students to enter a course at any point in the semester. "Students use holidays to work on these because they are off from their jobs. Thus, for instructors there is never any time for closure. This is the most difficult part of these courses for the instructor." "I don't think that DE is the absolute best method for all students in all circumstances for all subjects. It is helpful for motivated, knowledgeable students who have a separation or time/availability differently. It may be the only way for some to complete a formal education program. But is not the best method for all students and learning styles." " Students need to understand need for self-regulations and scheduling." "Students drop out, often earn lower grades."

Interviews of the Dean and Associate Dean of Distance Learning

The researcher interviewed the dean and associate dean of information technology on separate occasions. Topics discussed in these interviews included a summary of the (1) The Administrative Structure of Department of Distance Education; (2) The budget for the Department of the Distance Education; (3) their perceptions of factors that motivate faculty to participate in distance education and factors which inhibit their participation; (4) the college's budget for distance learning; (5) faculty training opportunities currently available; (6) challenges that distance education is currently facing from parties within the college and from external factors as well; (7) intellectual property rights policy currently in place at the community college; (8) the issue of rewards for distance faculty; (9) how distance courses are designed and delivered; (9) how the community college mission has impacted distance education; (10) predictions of the future for distance education.

The Administrative Structure of the Department of Distance Education

The Department of Distance Education has a director who reports to the associate dean, who in turn reports to the dean, who reports to the president. The responsibilities of the department are divided between two offices, both of whom have directors. One office administers synchronous distance education and the other office administers a-synchronous courses.

Initially the offices for synchronous and a-synchronous learning were housed at another location, off campus and the campuses viewed them as literally and figuratively operating on the periphery of the college. Phone calls for faculty were diverted to these two offices, as faculty were not always at their division offices and the departments didn't want to take phone messages. The distance education office also needed to track and see which faculty were actually responding to students' inquiries, holding office hours, etc. Student records were also kept at the distance education offices, so when students called staff could answer their questions.

Now, with the advent of the internet, the office administers a-synchronous courses in a totally different that involves faculty keeping in touch with students via email, rather than routing student messages through the distance education office. Thus, the office's ability to monitor faculty has changed in that it now acts more as an ombudsman for students (i.e., helping students who can't reach faculty) rather than providing direct clerical assistance to faculty (i.e., checking to see if faculty have received their students' assignments).

The Budget For the Department of Distance Education

The total budget for the Office of Distance Education is approximately 1.8% of the total college budget ($100 million) that amounts to $180,000, excluding staff salaries. From the general pool of college funds, expenses for certain services and salaries are accounted for, and based on a certain percentage, formula funds are allocated to each campus and the distance learning office. The amount of funds that are allocated to each office is driven strictly by enrollments. If enrollments increase then every campus receives more funding, if enrollments decrease, then all campuses receive less money. Funds are distributed through a formula that combines head counts and full-time equivalents (FTEs) by campus. For the sake of funding purposes, the distance learning office is considered to be a campus. However, the distance learning office is not entitled to many of the same funding sources as are the rest of the campuses, i.e., lecture funds (funds that would allow a campus to pay for a guest lecturer). Another way to describe the level of funding the distance learning office receives would be to describe it by the expense of each FTE by campus. The smaller campuses cost approximately, $13 to $15 per FTE and the office of distance learning cost about $20 an FTE, thus making it appear more expensive. If you calculated it by headcount, the bigger campuses were more efficient and the smaller campuses were less efficient, so distance learning was in the middle of that continuum. Therefore, it is difficult to determine by these numbers that distance learning costs more, as there isn't any campus to support.

Factors Which the Dean and Associate Dean of Distance Education Perceive as Motivating Faculty to Participate in Distance Education

Both the dean and associate dean agreed that many of the distance education faculty have chosen to participate in this type of education because it allows them more flexibility in their work schedule and it also relieves them from the classroom presentation piece. "It's something different for many who are tired of getting up and performing, " says the dean. There are some faculty who don't want to be face to face with their students and who may not exactly be characterized as "student-centered." Distance education enables them to teach what they enjoy without the physical interaction. Then there is another group of faculty for whom students are at the center of all their teaching. They perceive distance education as a way for them to reach out to students who normally wouldn't be able to enroll in a college course. Another group of faculty see distance education as an new avenue that gives them more freedom to be creative and provides opportunities for them to use ideas that they cannot use in the limited time and space of a classroom. Faculty also have a myriad of opportunities here at the community college to engage in all aspects of the distance process – design, delivery, and teaching. They can channel all their creative energies into developing websites and classroom assignments. Thus, as the dean says, "you've got different kinds of personalities."

Characteristics of Distance Education Faculty as Perceived by the Dean and Associate Dean

The dean described distance faculty as " faculty who, for the most part are in the second half of their careers and want something different to do and are excited by the technology." The associate dean characterized them in terms of the opportunities distance education provided them to seize, "These are the faculty members who get to offer their favorite classes, you know that esoteric English class for which never got enough enrollments on one campus. Here through distance education they can draw from five campuses and have twenty-five students." Distance education faculty comprise between 12% to 15% of the entire distance population (seventy faculty out of five hundred). They range from young newly hired faculty to more seasoned faculty who are approaching the midpoint in their careers.

The Dean and Associate Dean's Response to Faculty's Criticisms of Distance Education

The researcher then asked if so many faculty are enthused about this mode of teaching, how do you as dean and associate dean react to the criticism it so often receives? The dean replied that one of the most common arguments lodged against distance education is the lack of class discussion. "Most of the class, and again from an educational /psychology point of view and from an instructional design point of view, very little cognitive learning goes on in class discussion. What really happens in class discussions are motivation, liking of the class, but for many of the students it's just fun to be there, but it's not, it doesn't help you toward the end very well… Instructionally, how will it benefit the student to talk to these particular thirty people? Whereas in distance learning we can replicate all those learning objectives and make everybody do it and the other piece of it."

The adherence to face to face interaction relates to the social aspect of learning, for many students who are seeking support from their peers or view education as an outlet outside their work or family responsibilities.

The dean also mentioned that one of classroom faculty's biggest criticisms of distance learning is that it "steals students from their classrooms on campus." He explained that "The students who enroll in distance learning courses are either the ones who would be less likely to come to campus or the ones who were trying to fit a course into their schedule that they couldn't register for on campus. Some classroom faculty just don't like the idea that distance learning is a campus-wide program. Faculty don't understand that the Office of Distance Learning doesn't recruit students away from classroom courses. Our office and other distance programs should seek to be an education center and attract a variety of students who are interested in our courses. These enrollments would strengthen our enrollment and our revenue."

The Dean and Associate Dean's Perceptions of Division Chairs' Attitudes Toward Distance Education

Distance education has received mixed responses. Division chairs are responsible for determining a faculty's teaching load and the number of classroom and distance courses that will comprise that load. The associate dean has an advantage of having been the previous director of the office that administers the a-synchronous courses. Unlike her predecessor, she says that she has been able to develop a very good rapport with division chairs.

Both the dean and associate dean agreed that, previously, division chairs had not carefully monitored the number of distance courses which comprised their faculty's teaching load nor had they worked closely with the director of distance learning in determining what would constitute an even distribution of classroom and distance courses. The associate dean would send the division chairs forms to sign that indicated their consent for their faculty to teach a certain number of distance courses. However, when chairs realized that there were an insufficient number of faculty to teach classroom courses they would become very upset and would demand to know who authorized their faculty to teach a particular number of distance courses.

The associate dean attributed the difficulty in tracking faculty teaching loads to division chairs not realizing how quickly distance enrollments increase each semester. Faculty's load at this community college is determined by the number of credits for which each student registers. Twelve credits is equal to one teaching credit. Thus, due to the fact that distance learning is based upon rolling admissions, a student can begin a class any time in the semester and enrollments can compile rather quickly, enabling faculty to either meet or exceed their teaching load. The associate dean did add that the relationship that the distance education office has with division chairs has improved since she was hired as director of distance learning, as she is a former faculty member and knows the division chairs better than her predecessor.

The dean also noted that the relationship with division chairs, aside from the teaching load issue is rather complex. Recently chairs have requested that Blackboard (the technology by which distance courses are delivered via the internet) be accessible to faculty who teach classroom courses, however, they have not volunteered to pay for its access or the support services that faculty would need in order to implement this into their classes. Despite their desire to have their faculty use the distance technology, the dean of distance learning claims that they have publicly criticized the distance learning program publicly in college meetings, but when asked privately if these accusations were true, they admitted that their comments may not have accurately reflected how the distance learning program was administered. Presently, the dean is attempting to have the chairs retract these comments publicly so as to preserve the integrity of the distance learning program.

Distance Education Training and Faculty Responsibility for Design and Delivery of their Courses

The dean characterized distance faculty in terms of two groups: (1) faculty who are continually developing all their web-based courses by themselves, and (2) faculty who have been teaching via distance for a long time and are resistant to change. He described faculty who are teaching web based courses as trying to do it all – build and revise their websites, and facilitate students' learning in their courses. He characterized them as taking the sole responsibility for course design and delivery and therefore running the risk of "burning themselves out." Faculty who have been engaged in teaching written correspondence courses seem to be afraid of the world wide web. They are also suffering from burn-out as they do everything themselves and are reluctant to ask for assistance. The Office of Distance Learning has more faculty who want to teach both web-based and correspondence courses, but the dean wonders if the Office of Distance Learning can provide the assistance that they need, as both groups of faculty have different expectations and are motivated by different factors. Their willingness to listen or work collaboratively with course technologists is also questionable and the college's resources haven't kept pace with the faculty.

The associate dean described a need for the Office of Distance Learning to offer much more comprehensive training sessions that are focused upon delivery of distance education courses. She explained that in the past faculty who wanted to teach via distance would build upon and expand other faculty's courses. Thus, students would find a variety of distance course formats on the web. While this type of course development was beneficial to faculty in that it fostered collaborative learning, distance courses lacked particular standards or best practices. Recently the Office of Distance Learning converted the original six month long training exercises into smaller modules which are called workshops, as she and the dean thought that faculty would be more likely to participate in training that did not require a huge time commitment. However, this format of short workshops also has its disadvantages, as faculty usually complete the ones that interest them and therefore are not exposed to much sequential information that could help them in course delivery and design. The associate dean indicated that faculty attendance at training workshops has been sporadic. "Faculty either haven't noticed that training was available, they didn't take advantage of it when it happened and they didn't come back often enough." She predicted that in the future they will have to hire faculty who have a working knowledge of how to design and deliver distance courses and perhaps have them complete some type of assessment to determine their skill level.

During the interview the researcher mentioned that many faculty who had completed the survey expressed a need for faculty mentors who could guide them through the process of developing and delivering distance courses. The associate dean responded by providing the researcher with a brief history of how mentoring developed among distance faculty. Originally, distance faculty were required to come to the distance education office to hold office hours. Thus, they had opportunities to exchange ideas about course design, delivery, approaches to working with students, etc. and they would just exchange stories. Essentially mentoring and a bonding among faculty occurred naturally. One of the campuses that provides more distance education courses is attempting to create a mentoring program for their faculty. However, for the most part, distance faculty rely on the internet and phone to do their advising and are no longer required to hold office hours at the Distance Learning Office. Therefore, they don't interact as much with each other. The associate dean would like to try the program created by this one campus across the college, but right now she is faced with multiple priorities in her new position and wonders where she will find the time.

Intellectual Property Rights Policies Currently in Place at the Community College

The dean described the intellectual property rights guidelines at the community college as being "at best vague." He explained that the faculty own most of the material because the College hasn't invested many financial resources in these courses. In fact the College prefers that the faculty own them. In fact he reiterated several times over the course of the interview that the College really doesn't want to own them, as college ownership of the courses would preclude the College from selling them to a publisher." " Well, pretty much the faculty own them… it's interesting (sigh), it's not clear, I mean, the law would say they own them." However, if the College produces a tele-course with the faculty, it clearly belongs to the College. Ultimately, the College would prefer to license the course from faculty and have someone else teach it. The main question that will determine what type of policy the college will choose to adopt is, "For the course's real market value, would faculty be willing to share it with the College, and is the College willing to pay for it and is it really that good any way…. So, it's not so much who owns it."

The associate dean questioned the premises on which faculty are claiming that intellectual property rights belong exclusively to them. "Are these distance courses created as part of faculty's responsibility or are they created on faculty's own time using their own resources? If you were an employee of the College you developed this on your time as an employee, even if we didn't necessarily assign you to do that or did we and how much of the staff time and the how much of the College resources, and some people want to say 'Well, I did it all at home on my own computer.' No you didn't, you are still using our servers. It's debatable."

The Dean and Associate Dean's Response to Rewards for Distance Faculty

The dean and associate dean differed in their opinions of how faculty should be rewarded for participating in distance education. The dean thought that distance faculty should not be rewarded any differently than classroom faculty, as according to him, distance education is just another instructional method that is used to deliver courses. Despite all the complaints he receives from faculty about extra work involved in distance education, he still believes that if faculty set boundaries of when they would be available to reply to emails, respond to classroom discussions and have office hours, their workloads would be more manageable. "Distance faculty also don't take advantage of peer to peer kinds of things [among students]. They don't take advantage of say it once for everybody. Answer it once and then publish it. Tell students to look there first. They don't set up communication rules."

The dean also encourages distance faculty to build course models, note which designs work best and use these designs in subsequent courses. He said that in the past instructional designers on his staff would engage in an abbreviated form of systematic instructional design. Instead of creating a model and identifying the elements of effective instruction for each course, they would engage in a course modeling process of "fast proto-typing." This process allowed them to build a model based on elements that worked well, rather than identifying possible successful elements of instruction for each step of the course. He wishes that he had the staff and resources to engage in more systematic instructional design, however, this process would take a substantial amount of time and would restrict the college to a limited number of distance courses, instead of the one hundred and eighty courses they now offer. Ultimately the Office of Distance Learning would be spending more money to systematically design fewer courses and this practice would result in only a small difference in the teaching. If faculty are having a problem with their course the instructional staff will systematically examine each element of the course to determine where the problem lies.

In order to decrease a faculty's workload, the dean also suggested that faculty should anticipate the most commonly asked questions and areas where students will have difficulty. They can respond to these challenges by posting problems or exercises to their websites so the entire class will have access to them. Practices such as these will reduce one on one sessions with students that can contribute to an increased workload. He also calculated the standard classroom teaching load and compared it to the distance teaching load. "In a standard teaching load faculty have three contact hours so in a forty hour week faculty have three contact hours and three preparation hours for each class faculty are teaching, so that's six hours in a week, plus grading. Well, in distance education, if faculty don't have contact hours in distance education, all that time is available to meet with students and you are supposedly designing your class up front, compared to the classroom which requires you to adjust this design sometimes on a weekly basis. He reasons if faculty are teaching five classes at three credits each, that it wouldn't be unusual to spend six to eight hours on each class. If faculty teach the same number of classes via distance education, faculty are going to spend six to eight hours or more on each class. If you add up the time and keep a log you may discover that when these faculty taught classroom courses they were only spending four to five hours on each class per week." He cautions that this is an overgeneralization, but it's a fair estimate.

The associate dean provided the researcher with a brief history of how faculty were previously rewarded for participating in distance education. Apparently the Office of Distance Education had provided faculty with grants if they taught distance courses. Now this is the position where the associate dean finds herself when she tries to recruit faculty to teach distance courses. "… right now I find it difficult to ask faculty to develop a course for example because I have no way of giving them anything for it. The only advantage is that you'll be able to teach it this way and lucky you. You'll get to find out what all the other distance ed teachers find out is that it's a lot more work, but that's not appropriate. So, no, we don't have a good system." She described a distance program which they received a grant to develop. The program was rather haphazardly adapted for a distance environment, courses were not selected for their appropriateness for delivery in a distance environment and faculty were more or less instructed to participate.

Consequently, the program had low enrollments and the faculty were not interested in teaching in the distance environment. As she begins her new position in the spring semester of 2002 she hopes to call the College's attention to the fact that they need to provide some type of incentive for faculty to teach distance courses.

Both dean and associate dean agreed that the institution is committed to distance education. The dean described it in these terms, " …distance is just one of a whole bunch of instructional methods, but it's the quite frankly it's about the most innovative and only innovative thing we're doing because somebody was in charge. Our president said you will do distance education so we are doing distance education." However, both the dean and associate dean seemed to have a sense of frustration about the absence of a strategic plan for distance education at the community college. The associate dean described the creation of the distance learning office as an entrepreneurial effort of the previous president that was solely dependent upon faculty who were interested in teaching via distance. Presently, there are a couple of degrees that are well suited for total delivery via distance, but she attributes this as a mere coincidence. Other faculty teach distance courses because this medium allows them to offer the course that they are never able to hold on campus as they can't get a sufficient number of students. The associate dean described what she would like the strategic plan to embody. " I would like to see the entire College understand the role of distance education in the future of the College and have it articulate the faculty incentives for participating in distance education, the benefits students will receive if they enroll in distance courses and what rewards we can give to faculty for engaging in this type of teaching."

The Effects the Community College Mission has had upon Distance Education

The dean perceives distance learning as contributing to the portion of the College's mission that relates to teaching and providing access to learning. Some colleges offer a much smaller group of courses than does this community college, but they use it as a mechanism to create a more selective enrollment. Thus, fewer students are admitted, and they are more successful when they graduate. The dean's decision to offer more courses is closely linked to his belief in the mission of the community college and distance learning, "better to give them [students] the chance than to say we can only give them a few courses and so everybody else just waits or goes elsewhere. I don't want to say goes elsewhere cause there was no where else for them to go."

The dean underscored that the philosophy of the Office of Distance Learning has always been "….to give everyone a chance to succeed. We're not going to 'narrow the neck of the bottle' we'll take everybody and try to give them as much opportunity to get this as they can because this is the only way they may be able to get this course." He likes to emphasize that if students begin distance courses, they have a 50/50 chance of succeeding. The completion rate for students who are taking distance courses is seventy percent, which is fairly close to completion rate of classroom courses at the five campuses.

The associate dean admitted that the College has been struggling with the decision of whether or not to admit foreign nationals as distance learning students. Despite the fact that the college operates on the policy of open enrollment, they decided not to allow foreign national students to enroll in distance programs. This decision was influenced largely by the limited resources that are available to serve the current population of distance learners and the types of learners that enroll at community colleges, as they are not self-directed learners. "No matter how much you say to people, you're responsible for knowing the things that you need, figuring out how to get them, once they're enrolled, they think you've got to do everything for them. It's difficult enough for us to provide these services locally…."

The associate dean also addressed how faculty attempt to address the needs of traditional age students whose learning styles are not well suited for distance education. At the beginning of each semester faculty send letters to all of their students where they introduce themselves and give students pointers on things they can do that will enable them to be successful in a distance learning environment. Students' first assignment in every course is to write a letter to their faculty member where they tell the faculty member a little bit about themselves, why they are taking this particular course, why they are taking it via distance, and anything special or unusual they want to share about themselves. These letters from students give the faculty insight into the age of the student and the personal circumstances that surround their learning.

The associate dean explains the circumstances which surround traditional age student enrollments in distance courses which contribute some students' inability to complete these courses. "One problem we have experienced, particularly with general education courses, is when registration ends or classes are closed, registrations for distance courses increase drastically. The vast majority of these registrations are traditional age students who don't realize the commitment that a distance course entails. The associate dean has tried to caution the academic counselors at all the campuses not to encourage younger students to register for distance classes or at least try to talk with the student to determine if distance learning would be appropriate for them."

In response to the surge in distance registrations each semester, the associate dean asked one of their instructional designers to create a mini course entitled, "How to take a distance learning course." She admits that it has been on the back burner but it needs to be fully developed. "We've got to give them these kinds of tools, even though they might not always use them." However, she cautions that students who need to take these types of "how to workshops" are the least likely to complete them. Since we are an open enrollment institution, we can't require our students to complete any workshops prior to registering for a course. Presently, the distance learning web-site has a quiz that students can take to determine if the distance environment would appeal to their learning style. However, the associate dean questions whether students are honest with themselves as they are taking the exam and how familiar students are with their learning styles. She thinks that the convenience factor of distance education weighs far too heavily in people's decisions to enroll in distance classes, and it should not be the number one priority. Faculty are aware that convenience is a strong influence on distance enrollment and they try to reach out to students through telephone calls and emails, but if they don't respond, there's nothing faculty can do.

Academic Standards for Classroom and Distance Courses

While discussing the topics of the community college mission and rewards for faculty who participate in distance education, the discussion led to the topic of differences between classroom and distance education. When the dean originally was involved in instructional design in the 1970's, mediated instruction was essentially the same as today's distance education instruction in the sense that the classroom was open to the public. Faculty involved in mediated instruction always asked why it should be viewed any differently from classroom instruction. The dean pointed out that faculty who teach on campus are posing the same question and wonder why it should be given any special consideration. The dean agrees asks, "If it's good for distance ed to be held up to the magnifying glass, shouldn't we be looking at campus. The answer is yes, but when you look at the Southern Association (of Colleges and Schools) criteria and state community college system -everybody, they're looking at distance education because they could never get away with holding that (magnifying glass) up to the campus."

The dean admits to randomly visiting campus classes and confesses that there are some campus classes that are less than desirable. However, if individuals can only access them on campus, how would anyone know just how poorly they are taught? He points out that he can give you an assessment of every distance class. Thus, he questions, " So when they say, "It's not as good as", on what criteria? You've got good and bad on campus, you've got good and bad distance ed. The difference is we know."

Current Challenges and Expectations of Distance Education at this Community College

Toward the end of the interview the researcher asked the dean what challenges distance education is facing as an academic program here at the community college. He replied, "One of the most significant challenges that affects all areas of distance learning is the lack of resources, financial, human and technological, especially in light of the 70% growth in distance learning enrollments over the past four years. Our resources have not kept pace with our growth. The community college is a public institution and therefore is dependent upon funds generated by enrollment, but also funds that come from the state capitol. We only receive 2% of the budget, or $180,000 out of a $100 million budget."

Recently the state community college system has discussed spending $3 million to provide twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week support to make Blackboard available at the state system level. Of that $3 million, about a $1 million would be awarded to the community college where the primary data for this study was gathered. The dean explains his frustrations regarding the resources that have been allocated for distance learning, "For $200,000 to $300,000 the Distance Learning Office could provide the same level of support for the distance students enrolled in distance classes here. However, to provide this kind of support state-wide, the College will have spent at least half a million dollars of our budget to support the smaller community colleges. The dean believes that the honest about it and give them a loan. Politically, it will appear as though our campuses are 'getting a great deal' by allowing us to boost our support system to a 24/7 capacity, but what the state system is really just doing is bailing out smaller schools who can't continue to survive on their own."

The college needs to hire more faculty to teach more distance courses, as faculty have already taught their overloads for this academic year and they can't teach any more courses. However, current faculty are unwilling to share any of their courses with other full-time faculty, so new faculty must design all of their own courses. Therefore, before faculty can be hired, the college first needs to create an intellectual property agreement whereby the college can license the course from the faculty and let another faculty member teach it.

The associate dean also noted that the Distance Learning Office needs to develop more extensive supportive services as many of our distance students are not self-directed learners and therefore need more counseling and academic advising. In order to expand these services, the Distance Learning Office will have to hire counselors and support staff. Unfortunately, they may not be able to create and/or fill these staff and faculty positions as the state is experiencing a budget shortfall and there are indications that the community college system may institute a hiring freeze next year for all positions.

The dean noted that the inherent reason for the tremendous growth in distance education is not directly related to higher education. Rather, it is attributed the American cultural expectation that we will conduct business and communicate via the internet. Since the terrorists attacks of September 11th, Americans now do more shopping online as many are afraid to go to shopping malls. When Americans want to do research, they no longer go to the library to check out a copy of Consumer Reports, they consult the web. Therefore, if people conduct business over the web, get their information from the web, they may also want to enroll in classes via the web. The dean points out that there was a time when the leap from the classroom to the internet may have been a rather "big jump" for people, but not any more. In fact, it's a rather small step. Technology has become an integral part of our lives. For example teleconferencing existed three years ago, but it wasn't as sophisticated or as mainstream as it is now. President Bush uses videoconferencing to discuss the war in Afghanistan with his staff. "It's part of the main stream of what we do. We don't think anything of it. And so in higher education, distance ed, it's just what we do. It's a very small step from classroom. In fact why do I have to go to class three times a week? I can get everything I need on the web."

Predictions for Distance Education

The dean predicted that faculty will not be able to sustain the level of energy they are exerting in the development of their websites and distance courses. In lieu of faculty being responsible for the design and delivery of their courses, the textbook publishers will begin to develop high quality blackboard web-sites, and textbooks.

Both the dean and associate dean predicted that the terrorist attacks of September 11th will make students reluctant to come to campus or take all of their courses on campus and as a result enrollments in distance courses will increase. During the fall semester of 2001 this community college had its highest enrollment in distance classes at 6,000 students. Both the dean and associate dean wonder how their department will meet the increasing demand for more distance courses. Faculty have already taught their overloads and are not teaching any more additional courses. Courses originally slated to be offered in the spring have been cancelled as there aren't any faculty to teach them.

The associate dean also added that classroom enrollments might drastically decline, as people may not want to go to a public place next semester. However, the college is now so over enrolled that no one may visibly notice an enrollment decline.

Our whole world has changed since September 11th. All five campuses closed September 11th and 12th. The college has had numerous anthrax scares and bomb threats at various campuses as recent as late November. The headquarters for the community college system was even closed for three days in October because of threats. The associate dean also worries about colleges being targets of terrorism and the fact that few colleges in the this country have a system by which they can track F-1 students. "… the first college in this country that gets hit one way or another it's going to make everyone nervous and it doesn't have to be necessarily a multi-cultural circumstance because so many colleges aren't and the whole business of how many of our students, people are here on false visas, student visas and we don't follow up on student visas as a norm."

Chapter V will discuss the conclusions and implications of the findings of this study.

CHAPTER V

The Statement of Purpose:

The purpose of this study was to determine what factors influence community college faculty in their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education. This study examined the impact the following factors have upon community college faculty's motivation to participate in distance education: (1) demographic profile of classroom faculty, distance faculty and division chairs; (2) the extent to which classroom faculty, distance faculty and division chairs use technology to support their courses and to communicate with faculty, students and staff; (3) the length and degree of distance faculty's participation in distance education; (4) teaching via distance education, co-teaching via distance education and designing distance courses;(5) reasons cited by faculty for no longer teaching distance education or not wanting to teach distance education in the future; (6) The impact the absence of the research role has had upon faculty's decision of whether or not to participate in distance education; (7) the types of distance education delivery systems that are currently used; (8) percentage of faculty that did and did not receive distance education training; (9) years in which faculty received training; (10) where faculty received training; (11) delivery Systems faculty were trained to use; (12) release time for distance education training; (13) Level of interest in training of those faculty who never received training; (14) Areas in which faculty would like to receive training; (15) distance faculty's rating of technical and administrative support and technical and pedagogical training; (16) all faculty and division chairs' preferred delivery mode – synchronous or a-synchronous; (17) Faculty responsibility in designing and delivering distance courses; (18) distance faculty's, classroom faculty's and division chair's attitudes toward different rewards for faculty who participate in distance education; (19) Faculty and division chair's attitudes toward rewards for faculty who participate in distance education training; (20) Faculty and division chair's attitudes toward rewards for faculty who develop distance education courses; (21) The relationship between distance education and the mission of the community college; (22) factors that would motivate distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs to participate in distance education; (23) the impact that the faculty role changing from a knowledge provider to a facilitator has had upon faculty and division chairs' decision to participate in distance education; (24) factors that would inhibit distance faculty, classroom faculty and division chairs from participating in distance education; (25) distance faculty's, classroom faculty's and division chairs' attitudes toward distance education; (26) the number of distance faculty by campus and division who teach via distance education; (27) the number of faculty by campus and division who design courses that will be delivered via distance education; (28) the number of distance education courses offered by division at each of the five campuses within the community college.

Through interviews with the dean and associate dean of distance education this study also sought to determine: (1) the administrative structure of the department of distance education; (2) the budget for the department of distance education; (3) factors which the dean and associate dean perceive as motivating faculty to participate in distance education; (4) characteristics of distance faculty as perceived by the dean and associate dean; (5) The dean and associate dean's response to faculty criticisms of distance education; (6) the dean and associate dean's perceptions of division chairs' attitudes toward distance education; (7) Distance training and faculty responsibility for the design and delivery of their courses; (8) intellectual property rights policies currently in place at the community college; (9) the dean and associate dean's response to rewards for distance faculty; (10) the effect the community college mission has had upon the distance education; (11) academic standards for classroom and distance courses; (12) current challenges and expectations of distance education at this community college.

Previous studies on distance education were conducted at research universities and examined the impact of faculty participation in distance education in terms of tenure and promotion(Betts, 1998; Wolcott, 1999, 1997). This study was unique as it focused on factors that influence faculty participation in distance education at the community college where the majority faculty do not have research responsibilities and are hired on a contract basis.

The researcher adapted the survey used by Betts (1998) and test piloted it at four community colleges located along the East Coast of the United States. Upon completion of the test pilot, revisions were made to the instrument in light of comments from faculty, and directors of distance education and enrollment management. The primary data collection was conducted at a community college in the Southeastern part of the United States. The population of the primary study included distance faculty whose teaching loads consisted of distance education courses and classroom courses, or solely distance courses and classroom faculty whose loads consisted of solely classroom courses. The dean and associate dean of distance education were also interviewed for this study. The researcher received responses from 116 classroom faculty, 51 distance faculty and 13 division chairs.

Findings and Comparison Findings from Other Studies:

Listed below are findings that have been formulated as a result of this study. They are presented and discussed below according to topic

Rewards:

- The average mean of teaching loads for distance faculty who teach both classroom courses and distance courses at the community college where this study was conducted were heavier than faculty who taught only classroom courses. The average course load for distance faculty was 3.5 classroom courses and 4.35 distance courses while the average mean of faculty who taught only classroom courses was 4.35.
- Twenty-nine percent of distance faculty thought that faculty teaching distance courses should be rewarded with release time, while twenty-two percent thought that distance faculty should receive a stipend and release time for teaching distance courses. Twenty-seven percent of classroom faculty thought that distance faculty should receive release time and twenty-two percent thought that distance faculty should receive neither release time or stipends for their participation in distance education. Division chairs overwhelmingly thought that distance faculty should not receive a stipend or release time in return for their participation in distance education.
- Classroom faculty and division chairs were divided over the effect that rewards would have upon their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education. Thirty percent of classroom faculty responded that rewards wouldn't have any effect, while thirty percent replied that rewards might have some impact

on their decision to participate in distance education. Division chairs' responses mirrored those of classroom faculty - six chairs replied that rewards wouldn't have any effect upon their decision to participate while six chairs replied that rewards would have some impact. The vast majority of distance faculty responded that rewards would only have a positive effect, and only twenty percent said that rewards wouldn't have any impact on their participation in distance education.

The skills and knowledge that distance faculty must master in order to deliver distance education courses are quite different from those they learned for classroom instruction. Thus, as faculty's roles and responsibilities change and as the expectation of faculty change, so too should the reward system respond to that change (Harrison, et. al., 1999; Garrett, L. & Weiner, B., 1999). Traditionally, higher education rewards professional development with promotion and tenure. Merely expecting faculty to embrace distance education without any rewards linked to promotion and tenure can only discourage faculty participation (Olcott, 1991). The related issues of release time, monetary compensation, teaching load and available training all contribute to faculty's perceptions of distance education. Thus, institutions must provide the proper support for faculty and enable faculty to see, through an allocation of resources, that distance education is a priority at their institution (Olcott and Wright, 1995).

Participation:

- Ninety-six percent of the distance faculty who responded to this survey replied that they would continue to teach via distance education. Ten out of thirteen division chairs responded that they would like to teach distance education and forty-six percent of the classroom faculty who replied to the survey said that they would like to teach distance courses.

- Forty-one percent of current distance faculty preferred teaching non-synchronous courses while only 10 percent of faculty who taught only classroom courses preferred teaching non-synchronous courses. The vast majority of classroom faculty preferred teaching synchronous courses as they allowed immediate feedback from students, provided face to face interaction and enabled faculty to immediately detect learning difficulties.
- Distance faculty were almost evenly divided between those who were solely responsible for the design and delivery of their own courses (41%) and those who collaborated with course designers and other faculty to deliver and design their own courses (41%). Twenty-seven percent of classroom faculty replied that they would prefer to be solely responsible for the design and delivery of their own courses.

Most faculty participate in distance education as they are motivated by the intrinsic rewards that the profession affords them. These rewards include satisfaction of having mastered and integrated technology into their classes, providing educational opportunities to students who otherwise would not be able to attend classes, the richer quality of communication between faculty and students, the challenge of making ones' written word "speak" and the way in which the written word allows distance courses to "transcend time." (Holstein, 1992; Catchpole, 1992; Wolcott, 1998).

Faculty who have only taught in traditional classroom settings still have reservations about distance learning especially in regard to the their perceptions of its required workload and the quality of learning (Freberg, Floyd and Marr, 1995). Classroom faculty question, from a pedagogical context, the quality of student and faculty interaction, peer relationships that are formed, the role distance education serves within the administration of the college, and how it contributes or detracts from the school's relationship to the surrounding community (Clark, 1993; Newson, 1999). In addition to the impact distance learning has on relationships involving the faculty, the college and the student, classroom faculty also seek evidence of how technology has improved teaching and learning, as many view it as substituting their role as educators (Ehrmann, 1999; Beaudoin, 1990). Classroom faculty also project that they would miss students' verbal cues so easily seen and interpreted in a classroom setting (Gunawardena, 1992).

Training:

- Distance faculty are reluctant to participate in training. The dean of information technology described distance faculty as either faculty who are delivering their courses via the web and are totally responsible for all aspects of their course delivery and design or faculty who teach distance correspondence courses and are afraid to make a transition to teaching via the internet. Neither of these groups is interested in training. The survey results revealed that only 56% of current distance faculty have received training and only 31% of the distance faculty who completed this survey would be interested in any training at all.
- The majority of distance faculty (37%), classroom faculty (35%) and division chairs (39%) thought that faculty should be granted release time for developing distance courses. Some classroom faculty voiced concern that rewards for

distance education should be based upon teaching and learning results, teaching load, and not determined by the delivery method of distance education.

- The Department of Distance Learning has changed the format for faculty distance education training from a six month workshop to several short workshops. The only disadvantage of this change in delivery is that faculty usually complete the workshops that interest them and therefore are not exposed to as much sequential information that could assist them in their course delivery.

Faculty are like many other professionals who are continually engaging in training to update their technical skills while they continue to engage in their full-time teaching, serving on committees, meeting with students, etc. As adult learners, faculty only want to engage in learning that is relevant to their need for additional knowledge (Knowles, 1984; Brookfield, (1984). Parer, Crocker and Shaw (1989) found that purposeful learning weighed heavily on faculty's decision to participate in distance training. Faculty whom they surveyed about engaging in training for distance courses agreed to participate only if the training related directly to the distance courses they were currently teaching.

Intellectual Property Rights:

- The College's intellectual property rights agreement is very vague. The dean of distance learning described the agreement as allowing faculty to own all of the courses they have created. However, if the College produces a tele-course with a faculty member the course clearly belongs to the college. The question that has not been resolved is "Are these distance courses created as part of faculty's responsibility or are they created on faculty's own time using their own resources? "If you were an employee of the College you developed this on your

> time as an employee, even if we didn't necessarily assign you to do that or did we and how much of the staff time and the how much of the College resources, and some people want to say "Well, I did it all at home on my own computer." No you didn't you are still using our servers. It's debatable."

The preservation of intellectual property rights is one of the greatest concerns of faculty who engage in distance education. Faculty seek assurances that the course material they have created is not reproduced without their consent or without their reaping benefits of its distribution (http://www.aaup.org/DistncED). However, the ownership of material, particularly collaborative efforts with college course designers and technologists is difficult to ascertain, as they require the investment of institutional resources (Gorman, 1998).

The Relationship between the Community College Mission and Distance Education:

- Sixty-five percent of distance faculty, forty-four percent of classroom faculty and sixty-two percent of division chairs agreed that distance education best compliments the portion of the community college's mission that relates to teaching. Twenty percent of distance faculty, fourteen percent of classroom faculty and thirty-one percent of the division chairs placed distance education as contributing toward the service and teaching parts of the community college mission.
- The dean of distance learning emphasized that the community college's mission of open enrollment has had a bearing upon their decision to offer a broader selection of courses in order to provide more opportunities for students. The College seeks to make education accessible to everyone rather than adopting the

policy of smaller private schools, some of which only offer a few select courses via distance as a means of creating a more selective enrollment.

Participation in distance education is placed within the category of teaching and it is credited toward the faculty's total teaching record (Wolcott 1997). However, it could also be categorized as service, as usually students who enroll in distance classes are people who otherwise would not be able to register for classes on campus (Newson, 1999).

Faculty Perception of the Community College's Commitment to Distance Education:

Classroom faculty were divided over the College's commitment to distance education, twenty-five percent replied that they were uncertain as to the level of the college's budgetary commitment and the other twenty-five percent rated the College's commitment between very to somewhat committed.

Distance faculty replied that the college was philosophically committed to providing high quality distance education programs, but questioned whether the state would provide the college with sufficient monetary resources to continue to offer these programs. Division chairs were equally divided.

Faculty will be more likely to believe that the institution is strongly committed distance education if distance teaching is truly integrated into the activities of the academic department, especially in terms of budget policies, and policies related to promotion, tenure and merit. (Kirby and Garrison, 1989, Gunawardena, 1990; Dillon, 1989).

Motivating Factors:

- Motivating factors to which response rates from both distance faculty and chairs averaged mean scores above a 3.75 indicating that they heavily influenced their decision to participate included:

  Personal motivation to use technology

  Flexible working conditions

  Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses

  Intellectual challenge of distance education

  Ability to reach new audiences who can't attend campus classes

Studies conducted by Taylor and White (1991) find that faculty are generally motivated by intrinsic rewards rather than by external rewards such as monetary rewards. According to faculty who participated in studies administered by Taylor and White (1991), Dillion, Hengst and Zoller (1991), Johnstone and Silvernail (1990) and Clark, Soliman and Sungaila (1995), the factors which motivated them to participate in distance education included: the ability to reach learners who otherwise couldn't attend college, the opportunity to work with learners who were more motivated and self-directed, flexibility in their work schedules, the necessity to plan lectures and materials in advance, and the opportunity to use a broad range of media teaching aids.

- The average responses from classroom faculty did not result in any mean over a 3.25, which indicated that classroom faculty were neutral toward many of the motivating factors.

- Responses to motivating factors from classroom faculty, distance faculty and chairs that averaged mean scores below a 3.0, thus indicating they had a low degree of influence upon faculty's decision to participate in distance education:

  Creating support systems to retain distance faculty

  Opportunity to teach a distance course in an a-synchronous environment

- Classroom faculty who supported distance faculty being rewarded justified their opinions based upon the workload of distance faculty. "Much more work involved, continued time in interaction that is not reflective of FTEs (full time equivalents)…. Yes, DE faculty should be rewarded differently, especially if enrollment were larger than a standard class…Yes, DE faculty should be rewarded differently, as extra effort is always needed… Yes, DE faculty should be rewarded differently because doing a lot of extra work, planning and designing above and beyond what one came aboard to do should be rewarded." Other classroom faculty suggested that instead of spending time and money in trying to lure existing faculty to teach distance courses, they should attempt to attract new faculty who have a desire to teach distance courses. " First of all bend your efforts toward those professors enamored with technology." One distance faculty member echoed these sentiments of his colleagues who teach classroom courses: "We should not attempt to use money to convince traditional faculty to teach distance courses. We should hire faculty who have that interest and expertise."
- Some distance faculty voiced a concern that the time they spend teaching their distance students isn't valued as highly as the time they spend on campus. "We

are often made to feel as though we are not actually working because we may not be on campus as much. However, the work never ends." "More support and rewards and encouragement and appreciation and recognition." Other distance faculty believed that enrollments should be capped and the policy of rolling admissions should be curtailed. "I believe that the more important issue regarding compensation deals with the quality and student enrollment… Classes should be smaller it is a labor intensive way of teaching – amounts to one on one with many students…. Students cap at 20 and thereafter an overload ratio"

- The vast majority of distance faculty revealed a need for release time to develop courses and engage in distance training. "Yes, DE faculty should be rewarded differently. Lower enrollment/ release time for course design…. Yes, faculty who participate in distance education should be rewarded differently: 1) Time to develop course materials to learn the necessary software. 2) Decrease in class size since distance learning requires more individual attention and contact for each student…. Faculty need release time to develop courses."
- The majority of classroom and distance faculty and division chairs all agreed that the change from being an instructor to a facilitator did not impact their decision of whether or not to participate in distance education.

Inhibitors:

- The only inhibiting factor for which response rates from distance and classroom faculty and chairs averaged mean scores above a 3.75 (indicating that it either did or would highly influence their decision not to participate) was concern about faculty workload.
- An increased workload is a deterrent for many faculty who contemplate participating in distance education. The current reward system in place at many colleges does not provide faculty with any recognition for time spent planning and teaching a distance course. Gunawardena (1992) cautions that if faculty are not provided incentives to devote extra time to planning and designing distance courses, then it will become more difficult for colleges to retain current faculty and recruit new faculty.
- The only inhibiting factors for which response rates from distance and classroom faculty and division chairs averaged mean scores below a 3.0 (indicating that it either did not or would not
- highly influence their decision not to participate) included:

lack of professional prestige
Concern about the quality of students
Change in faculty role from teacher to facilitator
Teaching a distance course in a synchronous setting
Teaching a distance course in an "a-synchronous" setting

Faculty Attitudes toward Distance Education:

- Distance faculty and division chairs were overwhelmingly positive in their attitudes toward distance education. Eighty six percent of distance faculty and sixty-nine percent of division chairs described their attitudes toward distance education as being positive. Classroom faculty attitudes were more neutral (42%) than positive (33%).
- According to Rogers' (1983) theory of innovation , "an innovation is more likely to be adopted if it is perceived to be better than its predecessor (relative advantage), compatible with the needs and value system of the adopters, relatively simple and easy to understand (complexity) and if it can be tested and tried prior to (trialability) and can be seen by the adopters prior to adoption (observability). The research reinforces Rogers (1983) theory, as faculty attitudes improve as they gain more experience with distance education and as faculty become more familiar with technology and gain hands-on knowledge of how distance courses are delivered (Gilcher and Johnstone, 1989; Kirby and Garrison, 1989).

Distribution of Distance Faculty by Division and Campus

- Liberal Arts was the division that employed the most distance faculty (thirty-three), followed by Business and Technologies (twenty-two), Math, Science and Engineering (eleven) and health technologies (four).

Distribution of Distance Faculty who design Distance Classes by Division and Campus

- Liberal Arts faculty were the largest group of faculty to engage in course design (eighteen faculty), followed by Math Science and Engineering (fifteen faculty), and Business and Technologies (eight faculty).

Distribution of Distance Courses offered across Campuses and Divisions:

- Across all five campuses liberal arts divisions offered the most distance courses (seventy-three), followed by Business and Technologies (forty-two), Math/Science (twenty-two) and Health Technologies (four). Campus #2, which has the highest enrollment, also offers the most distance courses and Campus #5, which is the third largest campus offers the second highest number of distance courses (thirty-eight).

The Budget for the Department of Distance Learning:

- The Department of Distance Learning receives approximately $180,000 or 1.8% of the College's total budget of $100 million. The allocation of resources has not kept pace with the College's seventy percent increase in distance enrollment which has occurred over the past four years.

Some institutions provide distance education programs with just enough fiscal resources to increase enrollments without having to increase services on campus. Institutions should not rely upon tuition as the only means of maintaining a distance program and planning for its future development (McNeil, 1990). Faculty also worry that colleges will prevail upon distance education as a way of cutting costs and will downsize its faculty and staff (Freeburg, Floyd and Marr, 1995). The National Education Association predicted, "It is not hard to imagine California State University administration wanting one professor to teach a basic course that is beamed to twenty classrooms." The NEA cautions that distance programs succeed only if they engage the full participation of their faculty and the cooperation of administrators (NEA, 1992).

Issues which colleges and universities must consider when calculating any cost/benefit analysis of distance education programs include: (1) will a major investment in any technological system attract new students or provide a more convenient means for students to access classes? (2) Will this new technology support existing learning and teaching methods and interaction between faculty and students? (3) Does it allow for automatic collection of quantitative data for evaluation purposes? (4) Will the adoption of this new technology allow the college to expand the curriculum into new areas? (5) Will it encourage new areas of faculty research? (6) Will it attract industries who want to enter into new partnerships with the college? (7) Will it allow the college to make a better return on its investment by enabling it to attract more students without the expense of building and maintenance? (Barr and Tagg, 1995; Boggs, 1996; Gunawardena, 1990; Guskin, 1994; Hahn and Jackson, 1995).

Relationship between the Office of Distance Education and Division Chairs:

- Only recently has the relationship between the division chairs and the Department of Distance Learning improved. According to the associate dean of distance learning, in the past division chairs did not closely monitor the number of distance classes their faculty taught. Due to the College's rolling admission policy, which allows students to enroll in distance courses at any time, enrollments in distance classes increase rapidly and faculty can reach their maximum teaching load rather quickly. Thus, division chairs complained when their faculty were not allowed to teach campus courses because the enrollments in their distance courses had caused them to reach their teaching load capacity in a short period of time.

Plater (1995) advises that colleges need to help faculty examine how their time could be best spent in terms of the college's mission and service to its students. He calls upon department chairs to identify more creative means by which faculty time can be accounted for besides student seat time in a classroom, as technology will redefine interaction with students and how faculty use their time. Plater (ibid) also states that colleges' restrictive administrative structures prevent department chairs from assigning their faculty to any assignments outside of classroom teaching. These structures are what limits faculty's desire to become involved in new and innovative projects, as their personal incentives are strictly aligned to disciplinary success. Wolcott (1997) cautions that rewards for distance education are dependent upon the degree of commitment that the faculty's academic department is willing to make toward distance education. In times of financial constraints distance education has to compete with other institutional priorities.

Lack of a Strategic Plan for Distance Education:

- Both the dean and associate dean of distance education voiced concern that the College lacks a comprehensive strategic plan for distance education. They said that the degrees that are now offered via distance were chosen more by accident and the college has not made efforts to select degrees which would be more appropriate to deliver in a distance format.

- Institutional support, leadership and a clear vision of how distance education relates to the mission of the institution are essential if distance education programs are to be integrated into the academic culture and practice of any institution (Olcott and Wright, 1995; Dillon and Walsh, 1992). Departmental support is crucial for increasing faculty participation. Department and division chairs need to gain experience in distance education so they can become "influential advocates" and present it as a profession that is both valued and respected to the same degree as classroom teaching (Clark, 1993).

As colleges continue to change and evaluate their distance programs they should consider the following elements: the audience they are serving, the involvement of faculty in the instructional design process in design of student support services, advising, and the evaluation of technology and pedagogy used in distance programs. Presidents, provosts, deans, department chairs need to become involved in addressing compensation issues and should set the tone for how distance education is received throughout the college in terms of its academic endeavors and contribution to the academic mission. (Olcott and Wright, 1995).

Conclusions and Recommendations:

It is hoped that the findings of this study will provide insights to administrators of distance education programs at community colleges. There are implications for distance education administrators, faculty and staff who work in distance education environments. The researcher notes that after the data was collected, the governor mandated that the community college cut $4 million from its budget for this fiscal year in order to cut the state's deficit during the current economic recession. Thus, as a result the researcher has recommendations from a broad view of the results of this study in light of the recent budget cuts.

The instrument that the researcher used to collect the primary data was quite helpful in assessing the factors that deterred and motivated faculty to participate in distance education, the levels of training received and sought, the degree and quality of support received, and faculty attitudes toward rewards for participation in distance education. Information obtained from these surveys would allow distance education administrators to identify factors that would enable the College to attract and retain distance faculty.

Conclusion #1:

Division chairs and the dean and associate dean of distance learning need to establish a strong working relationship.

Recommendation:

Together these three parties need to establish the following:

- Which courses would be best suited for delivery via distance education and as a result which courses will be delivered in a traditional classroom setting and via distance.
- Criteria that will establish an equitable teaching load for distance faculty and will allow divisions and the department of distance learning to offer courses that will meet the needs of their students.
- A policy that distance courses should not be designated as purely overload assignments.

Conclusion # 2:

The policy of rolling admission for distance courses should be terminated.

Recommendation:

While this policy supports the College's mission of open enrollment to courses at any time, it poses several disadvantages:

- Faculty, the dean and associate dean of distance education and division chairs are prevented from having any control over a faculty's teaching load.
- Faculty whose enrollment increases due to rolling admission have a burdensome workload which may jeopardize the effectiveness of their teaching.
- Rolling admission can contribute to student attrition, as registration for distance courses increases drastically when on-campus registration ends. Registrations to distance courses at this time of the semester consist mainly of traditional age students, most of whom are not self directed learners and usually do not have the study skills necessary to excel in distance courses.

Conclusion #3:

Since the community college mission focuses primarily upon teaching, both classroom and distance faculty should be required to take pedagogy workshops each year as part of their performance evaluation.

Recommendation:

Workshops for both groups of faculty should include training in technology and should be offered in a sequence. Classroom course content and faculty teaching should be held to the same high standards as distance education faculty and courses.

Conclusion # 4:

The director of distance learning should identify an instrument that would assess faculty's technical and pedagogical knowledge of teaching distance courses.

Recommendation:

This assessment should be administered to every faculty member who wants to teach distance courses.

Conclusion #5:

Workshops should be designed for distance faculty that teach them how to manage their workload, mainly, how to set boundaries with their students, how they can help their students become more self directed learners, and how they can take advantage of peer to peer activities. These workshops should also teach distance faculty how they can build course models and apply the methods that work well to subsequent courses.

Conclusion #6:

Until distance education becomes more of a mainstream method of course delivery, colleges should provide release time or stipends to faculty who want to engage in training and develop distance courses.

Recommendation:

The cost of these stipends should be shared by the division and the department of distance learning to demonstrate that distance learning is an academic activity and has been integrated into the academic mission of the institution.

Conclusion #7:

The dean and associate dean of distance learning in coordination with the division chairs should hire full-time faculty who have experience in teaching distance courses and whose responsibility it will be to teach distance courses on a full-time basis.

Recommendation:

Designating full-time distance faculty will preserve the integrity of distance programs, prevent the distance programs from being dependent upon the availability of classroom faculty, and assure the availability of distance courses for all students.

Conclusion #8:

In light of the current budget cuts, experienced at the institution where the primary data was collected, and the fewer faculty who are available to teach distance classes during this 2002 spring semester, the researcher recommends that the dean and associate dean of distance learning and the division chairs examine the courses that generate the highest enrollments and are degree requirements and appoint distance faculty to teach those courses.

Conclusion #9:

Community Colleges should implement an intellectual property agreement that will allow faculty to retain rights to the material they have created and enable the college to license the course from its creator so other faculty could teach multiple sections of the same course.

Recommendation:

Such a policy would enable the College to attract and retain more faculty as they would not be expected to design a course every time they were asked to teach it and the policy would also protect faculty's rights.

Conclusion #10:

While the College is in the midst of creating an intellectual property agreement, they should, as was suggested by the American Association of University Professors, create an interim intellectual property committee composed of administrators and faculty who would represent the interests of both the administration and the faculty.

Recommendation:

This interim committee would serve as useful agents in both collective bargaining and non-collective bargaining environments and keep faculty and administration apprised of technological developments that may impact the contexts of distance education programs, legislation, and policy. The mission of such a committee would be to facilitate policy development and dispute resolutions.

Conclusion #11:

The College should establish standards of teaching and learning for distance and classroom courses and hold all accountable to the same criteria.

Recommendation:

The dean of distance education pointed out that the disparity between the standards for classroom and distance learning must be addressed. "If it's good for distance ed to be held up to the magnifying glass, shouldn't we be looking at the campus [courses]. The answer is yes, but when you look at the Southern Association's [of Colleges and Schools] criteria and state community college system -everybody, they're looking at distance education because they could never get away with holding that magnifying glass up to the campus." The dean admits to randomly visiting campus classes and confesses that there are some campus classes that are less than desirable. "However, if you can only access them on campus, how would anyone know just how poorly they are taught?" He points out that he can give you an assessment of every distance class. Thus, he questions, " So when they say, "It's not as good as", on what criteria? You've got good and bad on campus, you've got good and bad distance ed. The difference is we know."

Conclusion # 12:

In light of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and the possibility of further attacks, the dean and the associate dean of distance learning have projected an increase in distance enrollments as people may be more comfortable taking classes via distance than in a traditional classroom setting.

Recommendation:

If enrollments continue to increase, the Department of Distance Learning will have to provide extensive supportive services for students and faculty. They will have to hire more full-time faculty, staff and academic counselors. In light of recent budget cuts it will be particularly difficult to find the resources for these services. Thus, the Department of Distance Learning will have to shift the focus of its operation from program expansion to program maintenance. Some faculty and staff may be asked to work longer hours, especially if enrollments continue to increase. Given the budget constraints, resources may not be available to reward these faculty and staff with raises or stipends, although divisions or the department of distance education may want to consider giving them release time.

Limitations of This Study

The data gathered from this study is only generalizable to community colleges that are located in large metropolitan areas and have a population of distance faculty that is small, relative to the faculty who only teach classroom courses. Given the researcher's limited financial resources and time, the survey instrument was the most convenient and efficient means to gather data. During the data collection faculty were engaged in committee assignments and compiling surveys and reports that related to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools visit in April of 2002. Thus, some faculty did not have time to complete the researcher's survey and the response rate for classroom faculty only yielded 116 completed surveys.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research might include the replication of this study at community colleges located in metropolitan areas that have a more extensive distance education programs to determine what motivates a larger population of distance faculty to engage in distance education. Conducting this survey on a larger sample of distance faculty could produce data that is generalizable to the population of distance faculty who teach at community colleges in the United States. Other elements which could be augmented to this survey include:

- A comparison of intellectual property rights policies that exist at community colleges.
- Interviews with division chairs, classroom faculty and distance faculty about what motivates and/or deters their participation in distance education, their levels of training and their attitudes about distance education and rewards for distance education.
- A comparison of classroom and distance faculty teaching loads and the rewards systems currently in practice at community colleges.

- An historical analysis of the growth and development of distance education programs at community colleges.
- An analysis of distance education training programs in place at community colleges, faculty perception of these programs and records of faculty participation.
- A comparison of teaching loads, administration of distance education programs and reward structures at community colleges and research institutions.
- A study which compares faculty attitudes toward distance education at research universities, four year colleges and community colleges.

Summary

Culturally the western world has become accustomed to, almost dependent upon technology as a means of conducting its business, selling its stocks and communicating with professional colleagues and family with the use of technology, i.e., the internet, email, fax and phone. Technology has become a way of life and it has now extended to the realm of higher education. One Merrill Lynch associate projected in the year 2000, that by 2003 internet courses administered by higher education institutions would generate $7 billion annually (Shea, 2001). The instrument this researcher used measured the attitudes of distance and classroom faculty and division chairs' attitudes toward factors which would deter or motivate them to participate in distance education, the types of technology they use to facilitate the delivery of their classes, their levels of participation in distance education, types of training they have received or would like to receive, and their attitudes toward distance education, rewards for participation and its relationship to the mission of the community college. The researcher found the instrument to have great utility.

The factors which yielded the mean scores above a 3.75 and either had the strongest influence or would have strong influence upon faculty to participate in distance education were personal motivation to use technology flexible working conditions, opportunity to develop new ideas for courses, intellectual challenge of distance education and the ability to reach new audiences who can't attend campus classes. The factor which yielded a mean score above a 3.75 and either had the strongest deterrent or would serve as a strong deterrent to faculty's participation in distance education was concern about faculty workload.

This study found that the mean number of classroom and distance courses that distance faculty taught accounted for a heavier teaching load than the mean number of courses taught by classroom faculty. Despite this realiity, faculty were still divided as whether distance faculty should receive more rewards for their distance teaching than classroom faculty receive for teaching their classroom courses. Division chairs responded that distance faculty should not receive any rewards.

Distance faculty and division chairs were overwhelmingly positive in their attitudes toward distance education. Eighty six percent of distance faculty and sixty-nine percent of division chairs described their attitudes toward distance education as being positive. Classroom faculty attitudes were more neutral (42%) than positive (33%). However, while attitudes are positive toward distance education and enrollments continue to increase, the college has not had the financial resources to support the program's advances. This past year the Department of Distance Learning received $180,000 from the College's $100 million budget. However, in January of 2002 the College was directed by the Administrative Council to cut $2 million from their budget been January and June of this year and was warned that they may have to cut an additional $8 million. Given these financial constraints and the college's continued commitment to the distance program the dean of distance learning is confident that the College will retain its existing faculty and offer those programs that have strong enrollments.

It is hoped that, given the understanding of factors that influence distance faculty's participation in distance education, the findings of the current research will enable higher education institutions to create an environment where faculty's contributions are valued and opportunities for learning will be accessible to a diverse population of life long learners.

References

Astin, A. (1985). Achieving excellence: a critical assessment of priorities and practices in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ayer, S. & Smith, C. Consumer preference for flexible education. Open Learning, 13,1, 18-26.

Baldwin, R. (1998). Technology's impact on faculty life and work. In Gillespie, K. (Ed). The impact of technology on faculty development, life and work, New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 76, Winter, 7-23.

Barber, B. (1992). An aristocracy of everyone. The politics of education and the future of America . New York: Random House.

Barr, R & Tagg, 1995. From teaching to learning: a new paradigm for undergraduate education. Change, 27, 613-25.

Beaudoin, M. (1990). The instructor's changing role in distance education. The American Journal of Distance Education , 4,2,21-29.

Betts, K. (1998). Factors influencing faculty participation in distance education in postsecondary education in the United States: An institutional study. (Doctoral Dissertation The George Washington University, 1998. UMI Dissertation Services 9900013).

Blackboard Distance Education Site: (http://www.blackboard.com/)

Boggs, G. (1996). The learning paradigm. Community College Journal , 66, 3, 24-27.

Brookfield, S. (1986). Understanding and facilitating adult learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brubacher, J. & Rudy, S. (1976). Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1976, NY: Harper and Row, 62, 63, 111, 117, 119, 165, 170, 230, 231, 233-235, 258, 254-257, 292.

Burke, D. (1998). Ownership issues in On-line use of institutional materials. Cause/Effect , 21, 2, 19-27.

California State Planning Commission for Educational Technology (1992). The California master plan for educational technology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348 953) in Moquin and Travis Community Colleges on the Highway Major Issues for Technology Planning.

Cantor, N. & Cantor, M. (1998). The American century: varieties of culture in modern times. NY: Harper and Row.

Carnevale, D. (2001, August 31st). Teacher's union report criticizes business like approach to distance education. The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Carnevale, D. (2001, June 8th). University of Vermont considers intellectual property policy to foster distance education. The Chronicle of Higher Education .

Carnevale, D. (2000, May 12th). A college's detailed policy on distance education. The Chronicle of Higher Education .

Carnevale, D. (2000, June 9th). Duke University moves to set policies on on-line courses. The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Carnevale, D. & Young, J. (1999, December 17th). Who owns on-line courses? College and professors start to sort it out. The Chronicle of Higher Education .

Carr, S. (2001, April 6th). A Columbia University professor praises the interactivity of teaching on-line. The Chronicle of Higher Education .

Carr, S. (2000, June, 9). Faculty Members are wary of distance education ventures. The Chronicle of Higher Education.

Chautauqua Collection Website (http://members.aol.com/Alphadang /clsc.html)

Chickering, A. (1969). Education and identity San Fransciso: Jossey-Bass.

Chickering, A. & Ehrmann, S. (1996). Implementing the seven principles: technology as lever. American Association of Higher Education Bulletin, 49:3-6.

Chute, A.; Balthazar, L. & Poston, C. (1988). Learning from teletraining. The American Journal of Distance Education , 4,2, 3-13.

Clark, T. (1993). Attitudes of higher education faculty toward distance education: a national survey. The American Journal of Distance Education , 7, 19-33.

Clark, R., Soliman, M.,& Sungaila, H. (1985). Staff perceptions of external versus internal reaching and staff development. Distance Education, 5,1, 84-92.

Clark, T. (1993). Attitudes of higher education faculty toward distance education: A national survey. The American Journal of Distance Education , 7,2,19-33.

Cyrs, T. (1989). Designing a teleclass instructor's workshop addressing the differential skills needed for quality teleclass teaching. Fifth Annual Conference on Teaching at a Distance, Madison Wisconsin, August 8-10th.

Davis, H. and Smith, A. (1996). Changing apples into pears – transforming existing materials. Open Learning, November, 10-20.

Dillon, C., Hengst, D. & Zoller, D. (1991). Instructional strategies and student involvement in distance education: a study of the Oklahoma televised instruction system. Journal of Distance Education , 6,1,28-41.

Dillon, C. and Walsh, S. (1992). Faculty, a neglected resource in distance education. The American Journal of Distance Education , 6,3, 5-21.

Dillon, C. (1989). Faculty rewards and instructional telecommunications: a view from the telecourse faculty. The American Journal of Distance Education , 3,2,35-43.

Distance Learning Resources: http://webster.commnet.edu/roger/history.htm

Drucker, P. (1994). The age of social transformation. The Atlantic Monthly, November, 53-80).

Drucker, P. (2000). Putting more into knowledge. Forbes, May, 15th, 84-88.

Ehrmann, S. (1999). Technology's grand challenges. Academe, September/October, 42-46.

El-Khawas, E. (1999). The new competition: serving the learning society in an electronic age. Higher Education Management, 11, 2, 7-17.

Elman, S. (1994). Regional accreditation and the evaluation of faculty. Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum. 5: 71-78.

Frankel, J. & Wallen, N. (1996). How to design and evaluate research in education. New York: McGraw Hill.

Freberg, L.; Floyd, B.; Marr, K. (1995). Faculty attitudes toward distance learning. Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 6, 2, 145-159.

Gandolfo, A. (1998). Brave new world? The challenge of technology to time-honored pedagogies and traditional structures. In K.H. Gillespie (Ed.), The impact of technology on faculty development, life and work: Vol. 76, Winter, New directions of teaching and learning, 23-39. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Garrett, L. & Weiner, (1999). Keys to success in delivering distance learning on the internet. Distance Education Report , 3, 4, 6-7.

Gilcher, K. & Johnstone, (1989). A critical review of the use of audio-graphic conferencing systems by selected educational institutions. College Park: International Universities Consortium, University of Maryland.

Gillespie, K. (1998). Ed. Editors Notes. New Directions for Teaching and Learning. The Impact of Technology on Faculty Development, Life and Work, 76, 1-5.

Gladieux, L. & Swail, W. (1999). The virtual university and educational opportunity: panacea or false hope.? Higher Education Management , 11, 2, 43-56.

Gorman, R. (1994). Intellectual property rights: the rights of faculty as creators and users. Academe, 84, 14-18.

Green, K. (1999). When wishes come true: colleges and the convergence of access, lifelong learning and technology. Change, March/April, 11-14).

Grossman, D. (1989). Distance education: consolidating gains. In Proceedings from the Fifth Annual Conference on Teaching at a Distance. Madison, WI, p. 28-39.

Gunawardena, C. (1990). Integrating telecommunications systems to reach distance learners. The American Journal of Distance Education , 4,3,38-46.

Gillespie, K. (Ed.)(1998). The impact of technology on faculty development, life and work: Vol. 76, Winter, New directions of teaching and learning. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.1-5.

Green, K. (1999). When wishes come true: colleges and the convergence of access, lifelong learning and technology. Change , March/April, 11-15.

Guskin, A. (1994). Reducing student costs and enhancing student learning part. 1, reconstructing the administration. Change , 26, 5, 16-25.

Hahn, R. & Jackson, G. (1995). The keys to wise investments in technology. Trusteeship , 3, 6, 27-29.

Harney, J. (1996). Copyrights and the virtual classroom. Connection: New England's Journal of Higher Education and Economic Development, 11, 3, 47-49.

Harrison, N. & Bergen, C. (2000). Some design strategies for developing an on-line course. Educational Technology , 40-41, 57-60.

Hassenplug, C. & Harnish, D. (1998). The nature and importance of interaction in distance education credit classes at a technical institute. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 22, 591-605.

Holstein, J. (1992). Making the written word "speak": reflections on the teaching of correspondence courses. The American Journal of Distance Education , 6, 3, 22-33.

Inman, E., Kerwin, M. & Mayes, L. (1999). Instructor and student attitudes toward distance learning. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 23, 581-591.

Jewett, F. (2000). Bridge: A model comparing the costs of using distance instruction and classroom instruction. The American Journal of Distance Education, 14, 2, 37- 47.

Johnson, S. (1992). A framework for technology education curricula which emphasizes intellectual processes. Journal of Technology Education, 3,2, 1-10.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Johnson, J. & Silvernail, (1990). Report of faculty perceptions of community college of Maine instructional television systems. Fall, 1989. University of Southern Maine.

Karol, N. & Ginsburg, S. (1980). Managing the higher education enterprise. , 127-152. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Kirby, D. and Garrison, D. (1989). Graduate distance education: a study of the aims and delivery systems. In proceedings from the Eight Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Continuing Education. , 179-84. Cornwall, Ontario: St. Lawrence College of St. Laurent.

Knowles, M. (1984). Andragogy in action: applying modern principles of adult learning. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Knowles, M. (1977). A history of the adult education movement in the United States. New York: The Robert Krieger Publishing Company.

Kubala, T. (2000). Teaching community college faculty members on the internet. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24, 331-339.

Larned, J. (1888). An experiment in university extension. Library Journal. , 13, 3-4, 55, 75.

Leach, E. (1999). Tuning out education: the cooperation doctrine in radio: http://www.current.org/coop/index.html

Marshall, R. & Tucker M. (1992). Thinking for a living: education and the wealth of nations. New York: Basic Books.

McElhinney, J. & Bizhan, H.. (1999). Technical and pedagogical challenges faced by faculty and students in computer-based distance education in higher education in higher education in Indiana. Journal of Educational Technology Systems , 27, 4, 349-59.

McManus, M. and Lyne, P. (1992). Mainstream or margin? Open learning in the changing world of nurse education, London, ENB.

McMillan, J. & Schumacher, S. (1997). Research in education: fourth edition, a conceptual foundation. New York: Addison – Wesley Educational Publishers.

McNeil, D. (1990). Wiring the ivory tower: a round table on technology in higher education. Washington, D.C.: Academy for Education Development.

Menges, R. & Mathis, B. (1988). Key resources on teaching, learning, curriculum and faculty development. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Metzer, M., (1994). Scholarship reconsidered for the professoriate of 2010. Quest, 46, 440-55.

Meyer, K. (1998). Faculty workload studies: perspectives, needs and future directions. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse.

Mingle, J. (1992). Faculty work and the cost/quality/access collision. Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers. ED 356 730, 17, MF01: PC01

Mitchell, T. (1999). From Plato to the internet. Change , March/April, 17- 22.

Moore, M. & Kearsley, G. (1996). Distance education: a systems view. 4-8, 11-12. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

National Education Association of Distance Learning (October, 1992). CFA Professor, p. 3.

Newson J. (1999). Techno-pedagogy and disappearing context. Academe, September/October, 52-55.

Olcott, D. (1991). Bridging the gap:distance learning and academic policy. Continuing Higher Education Review. 55(1&2): 49-60

Olcott, D. & Wright, S. (1995). An institutional support framework for increasing faculty participation in postsecondary distance education. The American Journal of Distance Education , 9,3, 5-17.

Parer, M. (1988). Institutional support and rewards for academic staff involved in distance education. Victoria, Australia: Centre for Distance Learning, Gippsland Institute.

Peters, O. (1983). Distance teaching and industrial production: a comparative interpretation in outline. In Distance Education Perspectives, eds. Stewart, D.; Keegan, D. & Holmberg, B. 95-113.. London: Croom Helm.

Plater, W. (1995). Future work: faculty time in the 21st century. Change, May/June, 23-33).

Portman, D. (1978). The universities and the public: a history of higher adult education in the United States. Chicago: Nelson Hall, 43, 65, 70, .

Privateer, P. (1999). Academic technology and the future of higher education. The Journal of Higher Education, 70,1, 60-79.

Public Broadcasting's History: http://www.current.org/history/

Public Service Satellite Consortium (1988). Year of Distance Learning: Proceedings for Public Service Satellite Consortium's 1988 Member Audiobriefings. Washington DC: Public Service Satellite Consortium. ERIC Document Reproduction Service 310759.

Rogers, E. (1983). Diffusion of innovations. New York: The Free Press.

Ross, G. & Klug, M. (1999). Attitudes of business college faculty and administrators toward distance education: a national survey. Distance Education , 20, 1, 109-126.

Rudolph, F. (1990). The American college and university: a history. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

Schomberg, S. & Farmer, J. (1994). The evolving concept of public service and implications for rewarding faculty. Continuing Higher Education Review: 58, 122-40.

Scriven, B. (1986). Staff attitudes to external studies. Media in Education and Development. 19, 4, 176-183.

Smith, K., Eddy, J., Richards, T., Dixon, P. (2000). Distance education copyright, intellectual property and anti-trust concerns. The American Journal of Distance Education, 14,2, 5-13.

Smith, F. (1991). Interactive instructional strategies: ways to enhance learning by television. In proceedings from the Seventh Annual Conference on Distance Education and Learning, 125-128. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, School of Education.
Stanford Forum for Higher education futures. (1995). Leveraged learning: technology's role in restructuring higher education. Stanford:

Stinehart, K. (1988). Increasing faculty involvement in distance teaching. In Developing distance education, eds. Stewart, D., (1987). Daniel, J. and , Strain, J. (1987). The role of the faculty member in distance education. The American Journal of Distance Education, 1,2,61-65.

Strain, J. (1987). The role of the faculty member in distance education. The American Journal of Distance Education., 1,2,61-65.

Taylor, J. & White, V. (1991). Faculty attitudes towards teaching in the distance education mode: an exploratory investigation. Research in Distance Education 3, 2, 7-11.

Thackwray, R. (1997). Effective evaluation of training and development in higher education. Sterling: Kogan Page.

The University of Chicago website: http://www-news.uchicago.edu /resources /brief-history.html

The Wisconsin University Cooperative Education Website: http://www1.uwex. edu/about/history.cfm

United States Department of Commerce: http://www.esa.doc.gov/de2k.htm

Wagner, D., Martin, A., Conklin, C., Gorman, R., Rubiales, D. Kreiser, R.; Smith, M. (1999). Distance education and intellectual property. Academe, May-June, 1999.

West, G. (1999). Teaching and technology in higher education. Changes and Challenges. Adult Learning, 10, 4, 16-18.

Weston, C. & Cranton, P. (1986). Selecting instructional strategies. The Journal of Higher Education, 57,3,259-288.

Whitworth, J. (1999). Looking at distance learning through both ends of the camera. The American Journal of Distance Education , 13, 2, 64-73.

Wolcott, L. (1993). Faculty planning for distance teaching. The American Journal of Distance Education, 7, 1, 26-36.

Wolcott, L. (1997). Tenure, promotion and distance education: examining the culture of faculty rewards. The American Journal of Distance Education, 11, 2, 3-18.

Wolcott, L. (1998). Faculty motivation and rewards in distance education. Manuscript in preparation.

Wolcott, L. (1999). Assessing faculty beliefs about rewards and incentives in distance education: pilot study results. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to extend heartfelt gratitude to all mentioned here, as each one in their own way, provided me with me with guidance, support and encouragement that has enabled me to complete this dissertation.

Dr. Joseph Greenberg

I would like to thank Dr. Greenberg for his constant support, guidance, and mentoring which I received from the day I was accepted into the doctoral program at the George Washington University. I especially appreciate his staying in touch with me since he accepted his position of Regional Director of Admissions at the George Washington University and his willingness to serve on my committee. Most of all he has taught me by example the true traits of being an educator, for which I will always be most grateful.

Dr. Sondra Patrick

Dr. Patrick encouraged me to research the topic of my dissertation throughout my coursework and provided me with opportunities to gain knowledge of distance education from every vantage point. She also gave me a great appreciation for qualitative research. Most of all she truly opened new avenues of light when I couldn't see them and made me believe that I would achieve my goals. I will always be most grateful that our paths crossed.

Dr. Sal Paratore

Dr. Paratore was an excellent teacher throughout my entire program. I will always be grateful for his meeting me after class and on weekends to review things that I may not have understood in class. I have always appreciated his great patience and the manner in

which he taught his students. He is the kind of teacher who met with them as many times as was necessary to make sure they understood the material. Teachers like Dr. Paratore are rare and are an example I hope to follow.

Dr. Michael Corry

I will always feel fortunate that I had Dr. Corry for a course, as he was of thee most challenging professors whom I have ever had. My interest in distance education grew as a result of his teaching. I also appreciated the perspective he lent to my dissertation and his good natured helping manner.

Dr. Kristen Betts

Without her permission to use her instrument, this dissertation never would have been possible. Thank you!

Dr. George Gabriel

I greatly appreciated his helping me secure the faculty names for the distance survey, especially at a time when he was in the midst of conducting an institutional study.

The Faculty and Division Chairs who Completed Surveys for the Primary Data Collection

I greatly appreciated all of them taking the time to complete the surveys and return them to me. Without their willingness to share their thoughts my study wouldn't have been possible. Thank you!

Dean and Associate Dean of Distance Learning

I am most grateful that they allowed me to interview them for this study, as their perspectives added to the richness and depth of my data collection.

Cathy Simpson

When I needed information about distance programs Cathy responded so quickly and gave me exactly what I needed. The information she provided was extremely helpful.

Ron Liss, Alberto Ramirez, Richard Siciliano, Kay Shattuk and Jane Paulson and all the Faculty at the Community Colleges Where I Conducted my Pilot Study.

All of these individuals made it possible for me to conduct my pilot study and refine my instrument. Thank you for taking the time to facilitate the distribution of the survey and for taking the time to complete it.

Dr. John Thrash

Dr. Thrash has become an academic and professional mentor to me. I will always remember that he was the only person at my place of employment who made it a point to knock on my door to see how I was progressing on my dissertation. As simple as it sounds, this gesture provided me with the boost I needed to return home and continue working on my dissertation. I will always be grateful for his friendship and all the encouragement that he provided. I hope that in the future, I can do for a doctoral student as he has done for me.

Dr. Andrew Goldstein

Andrew did all the things that I couldn't find time to do- all the things that seemed to go unnoticed. For all the times you cooked dinners, and cleaned, did the laundry, and took care of the countless other responsibilities that allowed me to focus on finishing my degree, I thank you. For the various times I would say, "Can I do this? Is this possible?" and your response was always, "Of course you can do it. You'll get through it" I thank you. For your constant love, even when I was preoccupied with papers and exams and for always being there when I needed you the most, from the bottom of my heart – thank you.

Seymour, Sidney, Sammy and Louie

Thank you for being my boys and for all the unconditional love you have given me over all these years. At the end of every day you were always there to greet me and make me remember in the midst of all the dissertation stresses how important it is to love and be loved.

Mom

Betty Goldstein may be my mother-in-law, but she is really my mom. I will never be able to thank her for all the support she has given me and for never losing faith in me or my abilities. Most of all she was "thee one" who was always there, come rain or come shine. From the bottom of my heart, thanks mom!

Dr. David Goldstein and Dr. Lynn Hasher

Thank you for your many emails, advice and support, especially through the rough spots. I couldn't have a better brother and sister-in law.

Fr. James Lang

Fr. Jim's faithful friendship, jokes, lunches shared together, emails, phone calls, homilies, prayers and stories reminded me of the reason I entered higher education and the difference I hope to make. I especially appreciated his many emails and prayers during the week that I submitted the final copy of my dissertation. Fr. Jim you are a blessing!

Fr. Jules Brady, SJ

Fr. Brady has known me since I was a freshmen in his metaphysics class at Rockhurst College in 1982. He was responsible for planting the first Jesuitical seeds that spurred my intellectual curiosity and my love of philosophy and higher education. Most of all he had faith in me from the very beginning and told me that I could achieve anything, through hard work and the grace of God. I remain forever grateful for his friendship. Father Brady I shall always think the world of you!

Dr. Jane Holahan

I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to my colleague and friend Dr. Jane Holahan. Having been a fellow doctoral candidate, she completely understood all the challenges of the doctoral process. Her phone calls, and emails (sometimes on more than just a daily basis!) were a source of consolation and motivation. Her enthusiasm for learning and mastering the intricacies of research were contagious and has enabled me to reach this point in my program. Every doctoral student should be as fortunate as I was to have such a "comrade in arms." For all her prayers and for staying in touch every step of the way I remain forever grateful!

Julie Giessler "Email Mom"

Julie has known me since I was a young professional just having graduated from a master's program at Syracuse University. My friendship with her has grown and blossomed. Her many inspirational emails, prayers, compassion and concern have enabled me to face many challenges. For her friendship and willingness to have me share this journey I remain very thankful and blessed.

The 5:30 Community at Holy Trinity Catholic Church - Georgetown

The 5:30 Sunday liturgies at Holy Trinity, where I am a member of the choir, inspired me many Sundays through challenging homilies and heart felt music. It was at these liturgies where I placed many petitions for continued endurance, grace, enlightenment, patience, and understanding. I thank you God for giving me all these gifts that have enabled me to finish this dissertation.

May 1, 2001

Dear Dean of ___ Community College ,

I am Lisa O'Quinn, a doctoral candidate in the Graduate School of Education and Human Development at the George Washington University in Washington, D.C. The topic of my dissertation is "Factors that motivate and deter community college faculty from participating in distance education." The primary source of data for my dissertation will be the surveys I am distributing to faculty who teach both distance and traditional classroom courses and division chairs to whom these faculty report.

Community colleges provide opportunities for life long learning to millions of students across the United States, who otherwise would not have access to a college education. Their mission of open admission and access to all students enables them to become primary providers of distance education to students world wide. This survey provides you with the opportunity to express your views and opinions on distance education, primarily the factors that you perceive as motivating and deterring you and your faculty from participating in distance education, how the change of the faculty role has impacted your willingness and that of your faculty's to participate in distance education and how the presence or lack of rewards or support has impacted both your participation and that of your faculty's in distance education. The intent of this survey is not to serve as an advocate or opponent of distance education, but rather to identify factors that affect faculty's willingness to participate and not to participate in distance education.

This survey has been designed to include division chairs and faculty who are currently participating in distance education, those are teaching exclusively in a traditional classroom environment and those have previously participated in distance education. Only full-time faculty are included in the distribution of this survey.

Before you begin to complete the survey I would ask that you read the survey definitions included on the next page. Survey completion is approximately 15 to 20 minutes. All survey results will remain confidential and I will be glad to share the results with your institution. Please submit your responses to Dr. ___ by May 11th.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me by phone at 703-323-3164 or by email at loquinn@gwu.edu If you are interested in receiving a summary of results please let me know by phone or email. Thank you for your time and support.

Sincerely,

Lisa R. O'Quinn

Executive Summary of Dissertation Proposal

Factors that Influence Community College Faculty's Participation in Distance Education

The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Lisa O'Quinn, Doctoral Candidate

The purpose of this study is to determine what factors motivate community college faculty to participate in distance education. This study will examine the impact the following factors have upon community college faculty's motivation to participate in distance education: (1) the changed faculty role in distance education from a teacher centered role to that of a facilitator of learning, (2) the presence of or lack of institutional support (clerical, technical and administrative), (3) the presence or lack of institutional rewards (i.e., in terms of monetary compensation, release time or credit toward research, teaching or service), (4) the absence community college faculty's research responsibilities to the effect that not having to do research may provide faculty with more time to devote to teaching; (5) what measures is the community college engaging in to retain their faculty and encourage faculty new to distance education to teach in this medium and (6) extrinsic and intrinsic factors which motivate faculty to teach distance education courses

The researcher is seeking to conduct a pilot study at a community college where she will survey ten faculty who teach only classroom courses and ten faculty who teach distance education courses and two to three division chairs or persons to whom department chairs directly report. For the purposes of this study the researcher defines distance education as any type of education where the learner and instructor are geographically separated and learning occurs with the assistance of technology (i.e., web-based courses, interactive video, etc.). Those who have questions or want more information about participating in this pilot study may contact Lisa O'Quinn at 703-323-3164 or email her at loquinn@nv.cc.va.us.

Survey of Classroom Teaching and Distance Education Faculty

Definition of Faculty Classifications for Participants in this Study:

Classroom Teaching Faculty:	Faculty who have never participated in distance education and are teaching courses in a traditional classroom setting this spring semester of 2001.
Previous Distance Education Participants:	Faculty who have participated in distance education in the past, but are not participating in distance education courses this spring semester of 2001. These faculty may be teaching courses in a traditional classroom setting this spring semester of 2001.
Current Distance Education Participants:	Faculty who are teaching distance education courses this spring semester of 2001. These faculty may also be teaching traditional classroom courses in addition to their distance education courseload.

SECTION A:
ALL FACULTY PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION.

I. Demographics

Directions: Record the appropriate answer where there are parenthesis are found and answer short answer questions following the question.

1. In which division do you teach?

2. At which campus are you contracted to teach?

3. In which department do you teach?

4. Please indicate your gender: Male ( ) Female ( )

5. What is your age? Under 30 years old ( ) 30-45 years old ( ) 45+ years old ( )

6.What is your position title at the community college where you are contracted to teach?
( ) instructor ( ) assistant professor ( ) associate professor ( ) professor ( ) professional faculty

7. Are you tenured? Yes ( ) No ( ) If not, are you in a tenure accruing position? Yes ( ) No ( )
If you are not in a tenure accruing position are you in a contract position? Yes ( ) No ( ) If you are in a contract position, how many years are you contracted to teach at your community college? ( )

8. On which campus do you teach your courses?

9. How many classroom courses do you teach each semester?

10. Each semester how many distance education courses do you simultaneously teach at your community college while you are teaching classroom courses?

11. How many distance education courses do you teach at other institutions during each semester?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. How many years have you been teaching at the community college where you are presently employed?

13. Have you taught a course via distance education? Yes ( ) No ( )

14. Please identify the types of technologies you currently use to support your courses and use to interact with students, administrators, and other faculty. Check all that apply. ( ); Two-way interactive videoconferencing ( ); Two way on-line computer conferencing (yahoo messenger, interactive relay chat) ( ); Cable TV ( ); Interactive CD ROM programs ( ); Videotapes ( ); Audiotapes ( ); Radio ( ); Computer based technology (e.g., internet – World Wide Web):
Other:

If you are A **CURRENT DISTANCE EDUCATION PARTICIPANT** or **A PREVIOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION PARTICIPANT**
PLEASE GO TO SECTION B

If you are **CLASSROOM TEACHING FACULTY**
PLEASE GO TO SECTION C

SECTION B: CURRENT DISTANCE EDUCATION PARTICIPANTS AND PREVIOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION PARTICIPANTS

If you are a current distance education participant please place an x in the parenthesis ( )

If you are a previous distance education participant please place an x in the parenthesis ( )

Distance Education Background

Directions: Record the appropriate answer where there are parenthesis are found and answer short answer questions following the question.

Participation

1. How many years have you been involved in distance education?
Started this semester ( ) 1 year ( ) 2-5 years ( ) 6-9 years ( ) 10+ years ( )

2. What has your involvement in distance education included (check all that apply)
Teaching courses ( ) Co-teaching courses ( ) Designing courses ( ) Providing consultation ( )

3. How many distance education course have you taught during your professional career?
# of courses at the community college where you are currently contracted to teach ( )
# of courses outside of the community college where you are contracted to teach ( )

4. How many distance education course have you co-taught during your professional career?
# of courses at the community college where you are currently contracted to teach ( )
# of courses outside of the community college where you are contracted to teach ( )

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. How many distance education course have you designed during your professional career?
# of courses at the community college where you are currently contracted to teach ( )
# of courses outside of the community college you are contracted to teach ( )

6. What delivery systems are you using or have you used while teaching distance education courses? Check all that apply: Two-way audio/visual interactive conferencing ( ); Two-way audio, one-way video conferencing ( ); One-way live video ( ); Cable TV ( ); One-way prerecorded video (videotapes) ( ); Audiographics ( ); Two-way audio (e.g., phone conferencing) ( ); Radio ( ); Audiotapes ( ); Two-way online computer conferencing (e.g., chat rooms, yahoo-messenger) ( ); Computer based technology (e.g., Internet-World Wide Web) ( ); Other:

7.Did you simultaneously teach and/or design distance education courses while teaching traditional education courses during this academic year?
Yes ( ) No ( ) Number of distance education courses ( ) Number of traditional courses ( )

8. Are you currently teaching courses via distance education for companies, organizations or schools outside of the community college where you are teaching both distance and classroom courses at the community college?
Yes ( ) No ( ) If yes, what delivery system are you using?

9. If you have taught, co-taught or designed distance courses in the past and are no longer doing so please specify why you are no longer using this method of instruction

10. In what ways might your intellectual property rights influence your decision of whether or not to participate in distance education?

11. How does the absence of a research role at the community college affect your ability to participate in distance education?

12. What do you believe your community college could do to increase faculty to participate in distance education in the future?

13.What do you believe that your community college could do to retain the faculty who are currently participating in distance education?

Training/Support

14. Have you received formal training for distance instruction? Yes ( ) No ( ) If you did not receive formal training go to question 11.
If yes, (a) when did you receive the formal training?
(b) where did you receive the training?
(c) what type(s) of delivery system(s) were you trained use?
(d) did you receive release time for this training? ( ) yes ( ) no

15. If you did not receive formal training, how did you learn to teach distance education courses?

16. Would you be interested in faculty development programs that focus on distance education training? Yes ( ) No ( )
If yes, please specify topics of interest Check all that apply.
Two-way audio/visual interactive conferencing ( ); Two-way audio, one-way video conferencing ( ); One-way live video ( ); Cable TV ( ); One-way prerecorded video (videotapes) ( ); Audiographics ( ); Two-way audio (e.g., phone conferencing) ( ); Radio ( ); Audiotapes ( ); Two-way online computer conferencing (e.g., chat rooms, yahoo-messenger) ( ); Computer based technology (e.g., Internet-World Wide Web) ( );
Other

17. How would you describe the level of technical support you currently receive for your distance education courses?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

18. How would you describe the level of administrative support you currently receive for your distance education courses?

19. How would you describe the level of clerical support you currently receive for your distance education courses?

Rewards

20. Describe your perceptions of how well, adequately or poorly you are being rewarded by the college for any collaborative efforts you engage in with other faculty for the development or delivery of distance education courses. Also explain how these perceptions have influenced your decision of whether or not to participate in distance education.

21. Should your community college reward faculty differently for involvement in distance education than for traditional teaching and research? Yes ( ) No ( ) If yes, how should they be rewarded? If not, then why shouldn't they be rewarded differently?

22. How would you describe your satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the rewards, and compensation you receive from the college for your distance teaching?

23. In what ways, if any, does your time spent on distance education conflict with any other responsibilities that could offer you more professional rewards or recognition?

Change in Faculty Role

24. Most faculty who teach via distance education must change their philosophy about how learning occurs, how they understand their distance teaching in relationship to student learning and how they interact with their students. Faculty must change from an independent faculty role of teaching in a traditional classroom where they usually relay their knowledge via a lecture to a collaborative role where faculty work with each other in designing and delivering courses in order to create a learner-centered environment where students learn by interacting with course content, other learners and faculty.

25. Do you prefer to engage in synchronous or a-synchronous learning environments? Explain your answer and how these environments have influenced your participation in distance education.

26. Please place an "X" in the parenthesis that applies to your type of distance education delivery mode.
( ) I participate in a "systems approach" delivery of distance education (defined as a collaborative effort with other faculty, and course designers).
( ) I am solely responsible for the design and delivery of my own distance education courses.
Please explain why you are participating as an individual or via a systems approach to distance education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A. How do you think this paradigm shift of changing from a knowledge centered environment impacted your decision of whether or not to teach in a distance education environment?

B. How has the decision of changing from the role of knowledge provider to a learning facilitator impacted your decision of whether or not to teach in a distance education environment?

Relationship between the Mission of the Community College and Distance Education

27. Please check the category(ies) which you believe distance education would most appropriately fit the mission distance education serves at your institution: Teaching ( ) Research ( ) Service ( )

28. In what ways might the community college mission of community service and teaching lend itself to distance education?

29. If you perceive a lack of coherence between the mission of the community college and distance education how would you describe it?

30. What do you think the community college's policy should be on rewarding faculty for teaching distance education ?

31. To what degree do you think your community college is willing to commit its mission and budgetary resources in order to make the distance education program more successful (successful is defined as increased enrollments, increased faculty participation, increased faculty support and rewards for participation in distance education and increased retention of distance education faculty)?

Current Distance Education Participants and Previous Distance Education Participants
PLEASE GO TO SECTION D

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION C: CLASSROOM TEACHING FACULTY

Distance Education Background

Directions: Record the appropriate answer where there are parenthesis are found and answer short answer questions following the question.

Participation

1. Have you ever been asked to:
(a) teach a distance education course? Yes ( ) No ( )
(b) co-teach a distance education course? Yes ( ) No ( )
(c) design a distance education course? Yes ( ) No ( )
If you answered yes to any of the above please specify why you did not get involved.

2. Have you ever contemplated teaching, co-teaching, or designing a distance education course? Yes ( ) No ( )
If you have contemplated teaching a distance education course please explain why you did not pursue this method of instruction.

3. Would you be interested in teaching or co-teaching distance education courses in the future? Yes ( ) No ( ) Possibly ( )Explain your response.

4. Would you be interested in designing distance education courses in the future? Yes ( ) No ( ) Possibly ( ) Explain your response.

5. Would you be interested in participating in faculty development training programs that focus on distance education training?
Yes ( ) No ( ) Why? Why not?

If yes, please specify topics of interest that you would like these training programs to address. Check all that apply.Two-way audio/visual interactive conferencing ( ); Two-way audio, one-way video conferencing ( ); One-way live video ( ); Cable TV ( ); One-way prerecorded video (videotapes) ( ); Audiographics ( ); Two-way audio (e.g., phone conferencing) ( ); Radio ( ); Audiotapes ( ); Two-way online computer conferencing (e.g., chat rooms, yahoo-messenger) ( ); Computer based technology (e.g., Internet-World Wide Web) ( ); Other

6. Would your willingness to engage in training be contingent upon ( ) release time ( ) monetary compensation (neither) Please check all that apply.

7. Please specify what you think your community college could do to encourage you to participate in distance education in the future

8. If you were participating in distance education what do you believe that your community college could do to retain the faculty who are currently participating in distance education?

9. If you were participating in distance education what do you believe your community college could do to increase faculty to participate in distance education in the future?

10. What impact would the absence of a research role at the community college affect your ability to participate in distance education if you chose to participate?

11. In what ways might your intellectual property rights influence your decision of whether or not to participate in distance education?

Rewards

12. What do you think the community college's policy should be on rewarding faculty for teaching distance education ?

13. How have the rewards, or lack of rewards, influenced your decision not to participate in distance education?

14. Should your community college reward faculty differently for involvement in distance education than for traditional teaching and research? Yes ( ) No ( ) If yes, how should they be rewarded? If not, then why shouldn't they be rewarded differently?

15. How would any time that you would spend on distance education conflict with any other responsibilities that could offer you more professional rewards or recognition?

Change in Faculty Role

16. Most faculty who teach via distance education must change their philosophy about how learning occurs, how they perceive their distance teaching in relationship to student learning and how they interact with their students. Faculty must change from an independent faculty role of teaching in a traditional classroom where they usually relay their knowledge via a lecture to a collaborative role where faculty work with each other in designing and delivering courses in order to create a learner-centered environment where students learn by interacting with course content, other learners and faculty.

A. How do you think this paradigm shift of changing from a knowledge centered environment impacted your decision of whether or not to teach in a distance education environment?

B. How has the decision of changing from the role of knowledge provider to a learning facilitator impacted your decision of whether or not to teach in a distance education environment?

17. If you were to participate in distance education would you prefer to engage in synchronous or a-synchronous learning environments? Synchronous learning is a context where the faculty member and the student are teaching and learning in a live setting without any delay in feedback. Non-synchronous is a learning environment where there is a timed delay between faculty and student dialogue. Explain your answer and how these environments have influenced your participation in distance education.

18. Please place an "X" in the parenthesis that applies to the type of distance education delivery mode in which you would most likely participate if you were to engage in distance education.
( ) A "systems approach" delivery of distance education (defined as a collaborative effort with other faculty, and course designers).
( ) You would be solely responsible for the design and delivery of your own distance education courses.
Please explain the rationale for your answer.

Relationship between the Mission of the Community College and Distance Education

19. Please check the category(ies) which you believe distance education would most appropriately fit the mission distance education serves at your institution: Teaching ( ) Research ( ) Service ( )

20. In what ways might the community college mission of community service and teaching lend itself to distance education?

21. If you perceive a lack of coherence between the mission of the community college and distance education how would you describe it?

22. To what degree do you think your community college is willing to commit its mission and budgetary resources in order to make the distance education program more successful (successful is defined as increased enrollments, increased faculty participation, increased faculty support and rewards for participation in distance education and increased retention of distance education faculty)?

CLASSROOM TEACHING FACULTY
PLEASE GO TO SECTION D

SECTION D: ALL FACULTY PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION

CLASSROOM TEACHING FACULTY

For **faculty who have never participated** in distance education, please insert an x in these parenthesis ( ) . Please rate the extent to which you agree the factors **listed below** would **motivate** you to participate in distance education (1- strongly agree to 5 strongly disagree). Please circle (1-5) your response.

CURRENT AND PREVIOUS PARTICIPANTS IN DISTANCE EDUCATION

For **faculty who are currently participating** in distance education, please insert an x in these parenthesis ( ) . **For faculty who have previously participated** in distance education please insert an x in these parenthesis ( ). Please rate the extent to which you agree the factors **listed below** have **motivated** you to participate in distance education (1– strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree). Please circle (1-5) your response.

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Personal motivation to use technology	5	4	3	2	1
2. Reduced Teaching Load	5	4	3	2	1
3. Support & encouragement from division or dept. chair	5	4	3	2	1
4. More flexible working conditions (e.g., hours, location)	5	4	3	2	1
5. Increase in salary	5	4	3	2	1
6. Strengthened job security	5	4	3	2	1
7. Monetary support for participation (e.g., overload, stipend)	5	4	3	2	1
8. Expectation by the University that faculty participate	5	4	3	2	1
9. Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses	5	4	3	2	1
10. Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations	5	4	3	2	1
11. Receipt of grants for materials and expenses	5	4	3	2	1
12. Support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
13. Intellectual challenge	5	4	3	2	1
14. Technical, administrative and clerical support provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
15. Career exploration and expansion	5	4	3	2	1
16. Credit toward promotion and tenure	5	4	3	2	1
17. Release time	5	4	3	2	1
18. Distance education training provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
19 Merit pay	5	4	3	2	1
20. Royalties on copyrighted materials	5	4	3	2	1
21 Protection of intellectual property rights	5	4	3	2	1
22. Opportunity to diversify program offerings	5	4	3	2	1
23. Recognition and rewards from the college	5	4	3	2	1
24. Ability to reach new audiences that cannot attend classes on campus.	5	4	3	2	1
25 Opportunity to improve their teaching	5	4	3	2	1
26. Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider/ teacher centered to facilitating student learning	5	4	3	2	1
27. The opportunity to work with professional course designers, instructors and technologists to produce a course.	5	4	3	2	1
28. Creating support systems to retain distance education faculty	5	4	3	2	1
29. The opportunity to teach within a "non-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1
30. The opportunity to teach within an "a-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1

Please list any additional factors that have motivated you to participate in distance education or would have motivated you to participate in distance education.

1.

2.

3.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If you are a **CURRENT DISTANCE EDUCATION PARTICIPANT** or a **PREVIOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION PARTICIPANT**
PLEASE GO TO SECTION E

If you are A CLASSROOM TEACHING FACULTY
PLEASE GO TO SECTION F

SECTION E: CURRENT DISTANCE EDUCATION PARTICIPANTS AND PREVIOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION PARTICIPANTS

If you are a current distance education participant please check here_____
Please rate the extent to which you agree the factors listed below **would motivate** you **to continue** and/or **increase** your participation in distance education (1-strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree). Please circle (1-5) your response.

If you are a previous distance education participant please check here_______
Please rate the extent to which you agree the factors listed below **would motivate** you **to continue** your participation in distance education (1-strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree). Please circle (1-5) your response.

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Personal motivation to use technology	5	4	3	2	1
2. Reduced Teaching Load	5	4	3	2	1
3. Support & encouragement from division or dept. chair	5	4	3	2	1
4. More flexible working conditions (e.g., hours, location)	5	4	3	2	1
5. Increase in salary	5	4	3	2	1
6. Strengthened job security	5	4	3	2	1
7. Monetary support for participation (e.g., overload, stipend)	5	4	3	2	1
8. Expectation by the University that faculty participate	5	4	3	2	1
9. Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses	5	4	3	2	1
10. Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations	5	4	3	2	1
11. Receipt of grants for materials and expenses	5	4	3	2	1
12. Support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
13. Intellectual challenge	5	4	3	2	1
14. Technical, administrative and clerical support provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
15. Career exploration and expansion	5	4	3	2	1
16. Credit toward promotion and tenure	5	4	3	2	1
17. Release time	5	4	3	2	1
18. Distance education training provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
19 Merit pay	5	4	3	2	1
20. Royalties on copyrighted materials	5	4	3	2	1
21 Protection of intellectual property rights	5	4	3	2	1
22. Opportunity to diversify program offerings	5	4	3	2	1
23. Recognition and rewards from the college	5	4	3	2	1
24. Ability to reach new audiences that cannot attend classes on campus.	5	4	3	2	1
25. Opportunity to improve their teaching	5	4	3	2	1
26. Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider/ teacher centered to facilitating student learning	5	4	3	2	1
27. The opportunity to work with professional course designers, instructors and technologists to produce a course.	5	4	3	2	1
28. Creating support systems to retain distance education faculty	5	4	3	2	1
29. The opportunity to teach with a "non- synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1
30 The opportunity to teach with an "a-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1

Please list any additional factors that have would motivate you to continue and/or increase your participation in distance education.
1.
2.
3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CURRENT DISTANCE EDUCATION PARTICIPANTS and PREVIOUS DISTANCE EDUCATION PARTICIPANTS

PLEASE CONTINUE TO SECTION F

SECTION F: ALL FACULTY PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION

If you are **faculty who are currently participating** in distance education please place an X in these parenthesis ( ).

If you are faculty who have **previously participated** in distance education, please place an X in these parenthesis ( ). Please rate the extent to which you agree the factors listed below **would inhibit** your decision to **continue participating** in distance education (1- strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree). Please circle (1-5) your response.

If you are classroom faculty, are currently teaching courses in a traditional classroom setting and have **never participated** in distance education, please place an X in these parenthesis ( ). Please rate the extent to which you agree the factors listed below **would inhibit** your decision to participate in distance education (1-strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree). Please circle (1-5) your response.

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Concern about faculty workload	5	4	3	2	1
2. Lack of distance education training provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
3. Lack of support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
4. Lack of release time	5	4	3	2	1
5 Lack of professional prestige	5	4	3	2	1
6 Lack of your technological background	5	4	3	2	1
7. Lack of support and encouragement from dean or chair	5	4	3	2	1
8. Lack of grants for materials/expenses	5	4	3	2	1
9. Concern about quality of courses	5	4	3	2	1
10. Lack of technical, administrative and clerical support provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
11. Lack of merit pay	5	4	3	2	1
12. Lack of royalties on copyrighted materials	5	4	3	2	1
13.Lack of monetary support for participation (e.g., stipend, overload)	5	4	3	2	1
14. Concern about quality of students	5	4	3	2	1
15. Lack of recognition and rewards	5	4	3	2	1
16. Lack of salary increase	5	4	3	2	1
17. Lack of credit toward tenure and promotion	5	4	3	2	1
18 Loss of control over the teaching and learning process	5	4	3	2	1
19 Dislike for the collaborative nature of program delivery & design	5	4	3	2	1
20. The change in faculty role from providing knowledge to facilitating learning.	5	4	3	2	1
21. Having to teach in a "non- synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1
22. Having to teach in an "a-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1

Please list any additional factors that would inhibit your **continued participation** or **future participation** in distance education.

1.

2.

3.

ALL FACULTY GO TO SECTION G

SECTION G: ALL FACULTY PLEASE COMPLETE THIS SECTION

ALL FACULTY MEMBERS PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS

1. What is your attitude toward distance education in postsecondary instruction?
   Positive ( ) Negative ( ) Neutral ( )

2. What do you think the policy on distance education should be at your community college regarding faculty participation in distance education?

3. Would you participate in seminars and workshops on distance education if they were provided by the community college where you are contracted to teach? Yes ( ) No ( ) Possibly ( ). Please explain your answer.

7. What opportunities for faculty development and training in distance education, if any, should be available to faculty at the community college where you are contracted to teach?

8. How would your decision of whether or not to participate in distance education be effected if there were different rewards available for becoming involved in distance education?

9. Is there anything else you would like to say about distance education?

Thank you!

August 24, 2001

Director of Institutional Research
Community College

Dear Dr. _________,

I am Lisa O'Quinn, an administrative faculty member who works at the _________ Campus. Currently, I am conducting a survey of teaching faculty and division chairs and I need to ask for your help. This survey is for my dissertation, entitled "What factors motivate and deter community college faculty's participation in distance education." My survey and data collection procedures have also been reviewed and approved by the George Washington University Human Subjects Committee.

The survey asks faculty to rank on a five point Likert scale the extent to which they agree or disagree that certain factors have either motivated or deterred them from participating in distance education. Faculty are also given the opportunity to express their attitudes toward distance education, the quality of support they are receiving if they are teaching via distance education, the level of training they have received or would like to receive, their views on rewards for teaching via distance education and the role they see distance education having in the mission of the community college.

I am writing this letter to ask if I may distribute this survey to classroom and distance faculty and division chairs at this community college and interview two administrators at the Office of Distance Learning. I would like purposeful sample of all classroom faculty (faculty who are not currently teaching distance education, but who have taught it in the past, and/or faculty who have never engaged in distance education); all faculty who are currently engaged in distance education and all division chairs. My time-table for collecting this data is as follows: the last week in September I would like to send these surveys out through campus mail to all faculty and division chairs. The second week in October I hope to receive the majority of surveys and interview administrators at Office of Distance Learning. The third week in October I will follow up with faculty who have not responded. The first week of November I plan to analyze my quantitative data with the use of SPSS and code my qualitative data.

All survey responses and interviews will be kept strictly confidential. Faculty will not be asked to state their names and surveys will be coded according to division chair, classroom faculty, distance faculty and previous distance education faculty. If the distance education administrators will allow me to tape their interviews, I will give them the cassettes and a written a transcription of the interview. The name of the College will also not appear in the dissertation.

I would be very grateful if I could conduct the research for my dissertation at this community college and I am willing to comply with any and all requests the College has of all researchers who are collecting data from faculty. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me via email or phone at___________. Should you need to speak with Dr. Sondra Patrick, the chairperson of my committee, you may reach her at her work numbers, ___________ or at her home number_________.

I thank you for your time and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Lisa R. O'Quinn

A. Survey of Deans:
I. Demographics

Directions: Record the appropriate answer where there are parenthesis are found and answer short answer questions following the question.

1. In which division are you dean?

2. At which campus are you dean?

3. What is your age? Under 30 years old ( ) 30-45 years old ( ) 45+ years old ( )

4. How many years have you been working at the community college where you are now employed? ( )

5. How many years have you been dean at the community college where you are now employed? ( )

6. Have you taught any courses via distance education? yes ( ) no ( )
If yes, did you teach these courses through the community college where you are presently employed?
yes ( ) no ( )

7. Have you received any formal training for distance education instruction?
yes ( ) no ( )
(a) If yes, when did you receive this training? (please state year)
(b) Where did you receive this training?
(c) What type(s) of delivery system(s) were you trained to use?

(d) did you receive release time for this training? ( ) yes ( ) no

8. If you do teach via distance education specify the types of technologies you currently use to support your interaction with students. *Check all that apply.*
Blackboard ( ); ( ); Two-way videoconferencing ( ); Two-way on-line computer conferencing ( ); Cable TV ( ); Interactive CD ROM programs ( ); Video tapes ( ); Audio-tapes ( ); Radio ( ); Computer based-technology (e.g., Internet – World Wide Web); Other:

9. Would you participate in seminars, workshops and training sessions on distance education if they were provided by your community college? Yes ( ) No ( ). If yes, what topics would you like to see addressed in regards to distance education?

10. Would your participation in training for distance education be contingent upon (check all that apply)
( ) release time ( ) monetary compensation

11. How many distance education courses are offered through your division?
0 courses ( ) 1-5 courses ( ) 6-10 courses ( ) 11-19 courses ( ) 20+ courses ( ) Not sure ( )

12. How many full-time faculty are in your division are teaching distance education courses?

13. How many professors design distance education courses in your division?
1-5 professors ( ) 11-19 professors ( ) 20+ professors ( ) None ( )

14. Do you know how many faculty members in your division teach distance courses outside of the community college where you are currently contracted to teach? Yes ( ) No ( ) Not Sure ( ). If yes, how many?

15. If the college provides training for faculty in the area of teaching in distance education, would you provide your faculty with release time in order to attend these training sessions? Yes ( ) No ( ). Please explain why you would or would not provide release time.

16. Have you ever been asked to :

(a) teach a distance education course?	Yes ( ) No ( )	Did you teach it?	Yes ( ) No( )
(b) co-teach distance education courses?	Yes ( ) No ( )	Did you co-teach?	Yes ( ) No ( )
(c) design a distance education courses?	Yes ( ) No ( )	Did you design a course?	Yes ( ) No ( )

If you were asked to teach, co-teach or design distance education courses and you did not get involved, please specify why you chose not to get involved.

17. Have you ever contemplated teaching, co-teaching or designing a distance education course? Yes ( ) No ( )
If yes, did you pursue this method of instruction? Yes ( ) No ( )
If you did not pursue this method of instruction, please specify why.

18. If you did pursue this type of instruction, please specify why.

19. Would you be interested in **teaching** or **co-teaching** distance education courses in the future? Yes ( ) No ( )
Explain your response.

20. Would you be interested in **designing** distance education courses in the future?
Yes ( ) No ( ) Explain your response.

21. Would you be interested in participating in distance education training programs? Yes ( ) No ( ).
If yes, please specify topics of interest. *Check all that apply.*
Two-way audio/visual interactive conferencing ( ); Two-way audio, one-way video conferencing ( ); One-way live video ( ); Cable TV ( ); One-way prerecorded video (videotapes) ( ); Audiographics ( ); Two-way audio (e.g., phone conferencing) ( ); Radio ( ); Audiotapes ( ); Two-way online computer conferencing (e.g., chat rooms, yahoo-messenger) ( ); Computer based technology (e.g., Internet-World Wide Web) ( ); Other:

Assessment of Faculty: (Motivation) Please rate on a scale of 1 to 5 the extent to which you agree the factors listed below **would motivate the faculty in your division** to participate in distance education (1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly disagree). Please circle your responses.

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Personal motivation to use technology	5	4	3	2	1
2. Reduced Teaching Load	5	4	3	2	1
3. Support & encouragement from division chair or dean	5	4	3	2	1
4. More flexible working conditions (e.g., hours, location)	5	4	3	2	1
5. Increase in salary	5	4	3	2	1
6. Strengthened job security	5	4	3	2	1
7. Monetary support for participation (e.g., overload, stipend)	5	4	3	2	1
8. Expectation by the University that faculty participate	5	4	3	2	1
9. Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses	5	4	3	2	1
10. Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations	5	4	3	2	1
11. Receipt of grants for materials and expenses	5	4	3	2	1
12. Support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
13. Intellectual challenge	5	4	3	2	1
14. Technical, administrative and clerical support provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
15. Career exploration and expansion	5	4	3	2	1
16. Credit toward promotion and tenure	5	4	3	2	1
17. Release time	5	4	3	2	1
18. Distance education training provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
19 Merit pay	5	4	3	2	1
20. Royalties on copyrighted materials	5	4	3	2	1
21. Protection of intellectual property rights	5	4	3	2	1
22. Opportunity to diversify program offerings	5	4	3	2	1
23. Recognition and rewards from the college	5	4	3	2	1
24. Ability to reach new audiences that cannot attend classes on campus.	5	4	3	2	1
25 Opportunity to improve your teaching	5	4	3	2	1
26. Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider/ teacher centered to facilitating student learning	5	4	3	2	1
27. The opportunity to work with professional course designers, instructors and technologists to produce a course.	5	4	3	2	1
28. Creating support systems to retain distance education faculty	5	4	3	2	1
29. The opportunity to teach in a "non-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1
30. The opportunity to teach via an "a-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1

Please list any additional factors that would motivate your faculty to participate in distance education.
1.
2.
3.

Assessment of Faculty (inhibitors)

Please rate 1-5(1-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree) the extent to which you agree the factors **would inhibit the faculty in your division** to participate in distance education. **Please circle your responses**

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Concern about faculty workload	5	4	3	2	1
2. Lack of distance education training provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
3. Lack of support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
4. Lack of release time	5	4	3	2	1
5 Lack of professional prestige	5	4	3	2	1
6. Lack of your technological background	5	4	3	2	1
7. Lack of support and encouragement from dean or chair	5	4	3	2	1
8. Lack of grants for materials/expenses	5	4	3	2	1
9. Concern about quality of courses	5	4	3	2	1
10. Lack of technical, administrative and clerical support provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
11. Lack of merit pay	5	4	3	2	1
12. Lack of royalties on copyrighted materials	5	4	3	2	1
13.Lack of monetary support for participation (e.g., stipend, overload)	5	4	3	2	1
14. Concern about quality of students	5	4	3	2	1
15. Lack of recognition and rewards	5	4	3	2	1
16. Lack of salary increase	5	4	3	2	1
17. Lack of credit toward tenure and promotion	5	4	3	2	1
18 Loss of control over the teaching and learning process	5	4	3	2	1
19 Dislike for the collaborative nature of program delivery design	5	4	3	2	1
19. The change in faculty role from providing knowledge to facilitating learning	5	4	3	2	1
20 Having to teach in a "non-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1
. 21. Having to teach in an " a-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1

Please list any additional factors that you believe would inhibit your faculty from participating in distance education.

1.
2.
3.

Please answer the following questions.

Participation

1. What is your attitude toward distance education instruction in postsecondary education?

Positive ( ) Negative ( ) Neutral ( )

2. What impact do you think faculty's concern over intellectual property rights have upon your faculty's willingness or reluctance to participate in distance education?

Relationship between the Mission of the Community College and Distance Education

3. Please check the category(ies) which you believe distance education would most appropriately fit the mission distance education serves at your institution: Teaching ( ) Research ( ) Service ( )

4. In what ways might the community college mission of community service and teaching lend itself to distance education?

5. If you perceive a lack of coherence between the mission of the community college and distance education how would you describe it?

Rewards

6. What do you think the community college's policy should be on rewarding faculty for teaching distance education ?

7. Should your community college reward faculty differently for involvement in distance education than for traditional teaching and research? Yes ( ) No ( ) If yes, how should they be rewarded? If not, then why shouldn't they be rewarded differently?

8. How does faculty's participation in distance education influence your evaluation of faculty's performance or their consideration for promotion or renewal of their contracts? At the division level how do you reward them for their participation in distance education?

9. Most faculty who teach via distance education must change their philosophy about how learning occurs, how they understand their distance teaching in relationship to student learning and how they interact with their students. Faculty must change from an independent faculty role of teaching in a traditional classroom where faculty usually relay their knowledge via a lecture to a collaborative role where faculty work with other faculty in designing and delivering courses to create a learner- centered environment where students learn to interact with content, other learners and the faculty member. How do you think this paradigm shift has impacted your faculty's decision of whether or not to teach in a distance education environment?

10. What do you believe your community college could do to increase faculty to participate in distance education in the future?

11.What do you believe that your community college could do to retain the faculty who are currently participating in distance education?

12. To what degree do you think your community college is willing to commit its mission and budgetary resources in order to make the distance education program more successful (successful is defined as increased enrollments, increased faculty participation, increased faculty support and rewards for participation in distance education and increased retention of distance education facutly)?

13. Is there anything else you would like to say about distance education?

Check the category that best describes your involvement in distance education (involvement is defined as either teaching, co-teaching, designing or providing consulting services for distance education purposes): **( ) Currently involved in distance education, ( ) Previously involved in distance education , ( ) Have never been involved in distance education.**

I. Demographics

Directions: Record the appropriate answer in the space provided.

1. In which division are you division chair?____

2. At which campus are you division chair? ____

3. Please indicate your gender: ( ) Male ( ) Female

4. What is your age?( ) Under 30 years old ( ) 30-45 years old ( ) 45+ years old

5. How many years have you been teaching at the community college where you are presently employed?_____

6. For what period of time have you been division chair at the community college where you are now employed? _______________

7. How many classroom courses do you teach each year? ____________

8. How many distance courses do you teach each year? _______________

9. Please put a check mark next to the types of technologies you currently use to support your courses and to interact with students, administrators, and other faculty.

Types of Technology	**Technology you use to support your courses**	**Technology you use to communicate with faculty, staff and students.**
A. Two-way audio-visual interactive conferencing		
B. Two-way audio, one way video conferencing		
C. One way live video, two way audio		
D. Cable TV		
E. Two-way on-line computer conferencing (chat, Yahoo messenger)		
F. CD ROM		
G. Video Tape		
H. Internet		
I. Email		
J. Other:		
K. Other:		

10. Place a check next to the box at the right that best corresponds to your non-participation or participation in distance education.

Non- Participation or Length of Participation in Distance Education	Place a check in the box.
Have never taught a distance education course	
Started teaching distance courses this semester	
1 year	
2-5 years	
6-9 years	
10+ years	

II. Participation

11.Place a check mark in the appropriate boxes below.

Have you ever been asked to:	Yes	No	If you responded yes,	Yes	No	In the future would you consider:	Yes	No
A. Teach a distance course?			A 1.Did you teach it?			D. Teaching a distance course?		
B. Co-teach a distance course?			B1. Did you co-teach it?			E. Co-teaching a distance course?		
C. Design a distance course?			C 1. Did you design it?			F. Designing a distance course?		

If you answered no to any of the above questions please specify why you did not get involved.

12. If you have participated in distance education place a check in the boxes below that correspond to the activities in which you have been involved. Check all that apply.

Involvement in Distance Education	Place check mark in this column
A. Teaching courses	
B. Co-teaching courses	
C. Designing Courses	
D. Providing Consulting	

13. If you have taught, co-taught or designed distance courses in the past and are no longer doing so please specify why you are no longer using this method of instruction.

14. If you are teaching distance courses please place a check mark in the box next to the delivery systems you are using now.

Delivery Systems you are currently using	**Place check mark in this column**
Two-way audio-visual interactive conferencing	
Two-way audio, one way video conferencing	
One-way live video, two-way audio	
Cable TV	
Two-way on-line computer conferencing (i.e., yahoo messenger or chat rooms)	
CD ROM	
Video Tape	
Internet	
Email	
Other:	

III. Training

15. Whether or not you have received training for distance education, please complete the questions below:

A. Have you received formal training in distance education? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If you did not receive distance training and are not teaching distance courses, **go to question 16 below**.

If you did not receive distance training **and** you are currently teaching distance courses, **or** have previously taught distance courses please answer questions B-G.

B. If you didn't receive distance training, how you learned to deliver distance courses? ________________

____

C. If you did receive distance training, in what year did you most recently receive this training?___________

D. Where did you receive this training?____

E. What types of delivery systems were you trained to use?________________________________

F. Did you receive release time for this training? ( ) Yes ( ) No

G. Would you be interested in participating in further faculty development training programs that focus on distance education training? ( )Yes ( ) No. Why? Why not?

16. If you did not receive distance training, would you be interested in participating in faculty development training programs that focus on distance education training? ( )Yes ( ) No. Why? Why not?

17. Place a check mark in the box that best describes your current status:

You **did receive training** and are seeking additional training, ( )
You **have never received distance training**, and are seeking training for the first time ( )

Place a check mark in the boxes in the right hand column that correspond to the type of delivery system in which you would like to receive training.

Delivery systems used in distance education	**Delivery system in which you would like to receive training.**
A. Two-way audio-visual interactive conferencing	
B. Two-way audio, one way video conferencing	
C. Cable TV	
D. Two-way on-line computer conferencing (i.e., one to one yahoo messenger or chat rooms)	
E. CD ROM	
F. Video Tape	
G. Internet	
H. Email	
I. Other:	

IV. Support

18. If you are currently teaching distance courses please place a check mark in the box that best describes the quality of support you are receiving.

Kind of support	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Inadequate**
A. Technical support				
B. Administrative Support				
C. Technical Distance Training Provided				
D. Pedagogical Distance Education Training provided				

V. Distance Education Delivery Systems

Synchronous learning is a context where the faculty member and the student are teaching and learning in a live setting without any delay in dialogue. Non-synchronous is a learning environment where there is a timed delay between faculty and student dialogue.

19. **Whether or not you are currently teaching distance courses, would you prefer** to engage in synchronous or non-synchronous learning environments? Explain your answer and how these environments have influenced your decision to participate in distance education or would influence your decision to participate in distance education.

20. **If you are currently participating in distance education** please place an "X" in the parenthesis that applies to your type of approach you would like to use in delivering your courses.
( ) I participate in a "systems approach" delivery of distance education (defined as a collaborative effort with other faculty, and course designers).
( ) I am solely responsible for the design and delivery of my own distance education courses.
Please explain why you are participating as an individual or via a systems approach to distance education.
( ) I use a combined approach of consulting with faculty and course designers, and working on my own to deliver my distance courses.

21. **If you are not currently participating in distance education**, but would consider participating in distance education, place an "X" in the parenthesis next to the approach that you would like to use in order to deliver your courses.

( ) I would prefer to participate in a "systems approach" delivery of distance education (defined as a collaborative effort with other faculty, and course designers).
( ) I would prefer to be solely responsible for the design and delivery of my own distance education courses.
Please explain the rationale for having selected your particular approach to course delivery.
( ) I would prefer a combined approach of consulting with faculty and course designers, and working on my own to deliver courses.

VI. Rewards

22. Should your community college reward faculty differently for involvement in distance education than for traditional teaching and research? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes, why and how should they be rewarded? If no, why shouldn't they be rewarded differently?

VII. Relationship between the Mission of the Community College and Distance Education

23. Please check the category(ies) in which you believe distance education would most appropriately fit the mission distance education serves at your community college: ( )Teaching ( )Research ( )Service ( ) None of the three areas mentioned

24. To what degree do you think your community college is willing to commit its mission and budgetary resources in order to make the distance education program more successful (successful is defined as increased enrollments, increased retention of distance students, increased faculty participation, increased faculty support and rewards for participation in distance education and increased retention of distance education faculty)?

VIII. Motivating Factors

25. Please check the category that applies to your current status:
( ) Faculty who **are currently participating** in distance education,
( ) Faculty who **have previously participated** in distance education
( ) Faculty who **have never participated** in distance education.

Please rate the extent to which you agree the factors listed below **would motivate faculty within your division** to participate in distance education. Circle the number (1 – strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree) that corresponds to your response.

Factors that might motivate faculty to participate in distance education.	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Personal motivation to use technology	5	4	3	2	1
2. Reduced Teaching Load	5	4	3	2	1
3. Support & encouragement from division or dept. chair	5	4	3	2	1
4. More flexible working conditions (e.g., hours, location)	5	4	3	2	1
5. Increase in salary	5	4	3	2	1
6. Strengthened job security	5	4	3	2	1
7. Monetary support for participation (e.g., overload, stipend)	5	4	3	2	1
8. Expectation by the University that faculty participate	5	4	3	2	1
9. Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses	5	4	3	2	1
10. Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations	5	4	3	2	1
11. Receipt of grants for materials and expenses	5	4	3	2	1
12. Support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
13. Intellectual challenge	5	4	3	2	1
14. Technical, administrative and clerical support provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
15. Career exploration and expansion	5	4	3	2	1
16. Credit toward promotion and tenure	5	4	3	2	1
17. Release time	5	4	3	2	1
18. Distance education training provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
19. Merit pay	5	4	3	2	1
20. Royalties on copyrighted materials	5	4	3	2	1
21. Protection of intellectual property rights	5	4	3	2	1
22. Opportunity to diversify program offerings	5	4	3	2	1
23. Recognition and rewards from the college	5	4	3	2	1
24. Ability to reach new audiences that cannot attend classes on campus.	5	4	3	2	1
25. Opportunity to improve their teaching	5	4	3	2	1

Factors that might motivate faculty to participate in distance education	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
26. Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider/ teacher centered to facilitating student learning	5	4	3	2	1
27. The opportunity to work with professional course designers, instructors and technologists to produce a course.	5	4	3	2	1
28. Creating support systems to retain distance education faculty	5	4	3	2	1
29. The opportunity to teach within a "synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1
30. The opportunity to teach within an "a-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1

IX. Inhibiting Factors

26. Please check the category that applies to your current status:
( ) Faculty who **are currently participating** in distance education
( ) Faculty who **have previously participated** in distance education
( ) Faculty who **have never participated** in distance education

Please rate the extent to which you agree the factors listed below **would inhibit the faculty in your division** from participating in distance education. Circle the number (5- strongly agree to 1 strongly disagree) that corresponds best with your response.

Factors that may inhibit faculty participation in distance education.	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
1. Concern about faculty workload	5	4	3	2	1
2. Lack of distance education training provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
3. Lack of support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
4. Lack of release time	5	4	3	2	1
5. Lack of professional prestige	5	4	3	2	1
6. Lack of your technological background	5	4	3	2	1
7. Lack of support and encouragement from dean or chair	5	4	3	2	1
8. Lack of grants for materials/expenses	5	4	3	2	1
9. Concern about quality of courses	5	4	3	2	1
10. Lack of technical, administrative and clerical support provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
11. Lack of merit pay	5	4	3	2	1
12. Lack of royalties on copyrighted materials	5	4	3	2	1
13.Lack of monetary support for participation (e.g., stipend, overload)	5	4	3	2	1
14. Concern about quality of students	5	4	3	2	1

Factors that may inhibit faculty participation in distance education.	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
15. Lack of recognition and rewards	5	4	3	2	1
16. Lack of salary increase	5	4	3	2	1
17. Lack of credit toward tenure and promotion	5	4	3	2	1
18. Loss of control over the teaching and learning process	5	4	3	2	1
19. Dislike for the collaborative nature of program delivery & design	5	4	3	2	1
20. The change in faculty role from providing knowledge to facilitating learning.	5	4	3	2	1
21. Having to teach in a "synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1
22. Having to teach in an "a-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1

X. Distance Education within Your Division

27.Please reply to the questions below.

How many distance courses are offered through your division?______________
How many full-time faculty in your division are teaching distance education courses? ____________
How many full-time faculty in your division design distance education courses?________________
Do you provide release time to faculty who want to participate in distance education training? ( ) yes ( ) no.
Below please explain your rationale for providing or not providing release time for faculty to receive training in delivery of distance education courses.

XI. Closing Questions:

28. What is your attitude toward distance education in postsecondary instruction?
( )Positive ( )Negative ( )Neutral

29. How would your decision of whether or not to participate in distance education be effected if there were different rewards available for becoming involved in distance education?

30. How does the absence of a research role at the community college affect your ability to participate in distance education?

31. How could your community college induce faculty to participate in distance education and retain them as distance faculty in the future?

32. *A facilitator enables students to interact with course content, learn from classmates and become active participants in their own learning. How do you think this paradigm shift from being a teacher who gives expert knowledge to a facilitator has impacted your decision of whether or not to teach in a distance education environment?

33. Is there anything else you would like to say about distance education?

Moore, M. & Kearsley, G. (1996). Distance education: a systems view.. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Dear Community College Deans,

I am Lisa O'Quinn, an administrative faculty member who works at the _________ Campus. Currently, I am conducting a survey of teaching faculty and division chairs and I need to ask for your help. This survey is for my dissertation, entitled "What factors motivate and deter community college faculty's participation in distance education."

Having worked at this community college and a community college in Upstate New York , I have seen how faculty like you can provide opportunities for life long learning to students who otherwise would not have access to a college education. This survey provides you with the opportunity to express your views and opinions on distance education; primarily the factors that motivate and deter you from participating, how the change of the faculty role has impacted your participation and the presence or lack of rewards or support has had upon your decision of whether or not to participate in distance education. The intent of this survey is not to support or oppose distance education, but rather to identify factors that affect faculty's willingness to participate or not to participate in distance education.

This survey has been designed to include faculty who do not participate in distance education, those who participate and have previously participated in both classroom and distance education and those who participate only in distance education. Only full-time faculty have been randomly selected to receive this survey.

I know you are very busy, but, I would greatly appreciate it if you could take a few minutes to complete the survey and return it to me via campus mail. Please use the address label I have attached and place it on the campus envelope. Your survey serves as my primary source of data for this dissertation. I assure you that any thoughts you share on this survey will remain in **complete confidence**.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone at _____ or by email at ____________ . If you are interested in receiving a summary of results please let me know by phone or email. Thank you for your time and support.

Sincerely,

Lisa R. O'Quinn

Dear Extended Learning Institute Administrator,

I am Lisa O'Quinn, an administrative faculty member who works at the Annandale Campus. Currently, I am conducting a survey of teaching faculty and division chairs and I need to ask for your help. This survey is for my dissertation, entitled "What factors motivate and deter community college faculty's participation in distance education."

I would like to interview you about your views and opinions on distance education. My primary questions are how the distance education program is administered at Northern Virginia Community College, the manner in which resources are allocated to your program and how these budgetary decisions impact your ability to administer quality distance programs. I would also like to ask you to discuss factors that you believe motivate or deter faculty from participating in distance education, and how the presence or lack of rewards or support has impacted your ability to recruit and retain faculty in distance education. The intent of this interview is not to support or oppose distance education, but rather to identify factors that affect your ability to maintain and enhance the development of a distance education program within a community college. I have attached a list of interview questions and ask that you please give them thoughtful consideration before our interview.

I also request that the interview be taped so it may be transcribed and coded, as this interview will serve as a primary source of qualitative data for my dissertation. I will gladly give you the cassette that I used to tape the interview along with a transcription of the interview. I will be the only one who will have the notes from your interview and I will keep your name, comments and the name of the college **completely confidential**.

If you have any questions please don't hesitate to contact me at 703-323-3164 or email me at loquinn@nv.cc.va.us. Please let me know if you would be willing to grant the interview, and if so what time would be convenient for me to meet with you. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Lisa R. O'Quinn

Check the category that best describes your involvement in distance education (involvement is defined as either teaching, co-teaching, designing or providing consulting services for distance education purposes): **( ) Currently involved in distance education, ( ) Previously involved in distance education, ( ) Have never been involved in distance education.**

I. Demographics

Directions: Record the appropriate answer in the space provided.

1. In which division do you teach?____

2. At which campus are you contracted to teach? ______________________________

3. Please indicate your gender: ( ) Male ( ) Female

4. What is your age?( ) Under 30 years old ( ) 30-45 years old ( ) 45+ years old

5.What is your position title at the community college where you are contracted to teach?
( ) instructor ( ) assistant professor ( ) associate professor ( ) professor ( ) professional faculty

6. Check the parenthesis which best describes your appointment status: ( ) Tenured ( ) Tenured Track
( ) Contract

7. How many years have you been teaching at the community college where you are presently employed?_____

8. How many classroom courses do you teach each semester? ____________

9. How many distance courses do you teach each semester? _______________

10. Please put a check mark next to the types of technologies you currently use to support your courses and/or to interact with students, administrators, and other faculty.

Types of Technology	**Technology you use to support your courses**	**Technology you use to communicate with faculty, staff and students.**
A. Two-way audio-visual interactive conferencing		
B. Two-way audio, one way video conferencing		
C. One way live video, two way audio		
D. Cable TV		
E. Two-way on-line computer conferencing (chat, Yahoo messenger)		
F. CD ROM		
G. Video tape		
H. Internet		
I. Email		
J. Other:		
K. Other:		
L. None of the above		

11. Place a check next to the box at the right that best corresponds to your non-participation or the length of your participation in distance education.

Non-Participation or Length of Participation in Distance Education	Place a check in the box.
Have never taught a distance education course	
Started teaching distance courses this semester	
1 year	
2-5 years	
6-9 years	
10+ years	

II. Participation

12. Place a check mark in the appropriate boxes below.

Have you ever been asked to:	Yes	No	If you responded yes,	Yes	No	In the future would you consider:	Yes	No
A. Teach a distance course?			A 1. Did you teach it?			D. Teaching a distance course?		
B. Co-teach a distance course?			B1. Did you co-teach it?			E. Co-teaching a distance course?		
C. Design a distance course?			C 1. Did you design it?			F. Designing a distance course?		

If you answered no to any of the above questions, please specify why you did not get involved.

13. If you have participated in distance education place a check in the boxes below that correspond to the activities in which you have been involved. Check all that apply.

Involvement in Distance Education	Place check mark in this column
A. Teaching courses	
B. Co-teaching courses	
C. Designing Courses	
D. Providing Consulting	

14. If you have taught, co-taught or designed distance courses in the past and are no longer doing so, please specify why you are no longer using this method of instruction.

15. If you are teaching distance courses, please place a check mark in the box next to the delivery systems you are using now.

Types of Delivery Systems used in distance education.	Place your check mark in this column
A. Two-way audio-visual interactive conferencing	
B. Two-way audio, one way video conferencing	
C. One way live video, two way audio	
D. Cable TV	
E. Two-way on-line computer conferencing (chat, Yahoo messenger)	
F. CD ROM	
G. Video Tape	
H. Internet	
I. Email	
J. Other:	

III. Training

16. Whether or not you have not received training for distance education, please complete the questions below:

A. Have you received formal training in distance education? ( ) Yes ( ) No

If you did not receive distance training and are not teaching distance courses, **go to question 17 below**.

If you did not receive distance training **and** you are currently teaching distance courses, **or** have previously taught distance courses, please answer questions B-G.

B. If not, how you learned to deliver distance courses? ____________________________
C. If yes, in what year did you most recently receive distance training?______________________
D. Where did you receive this training?____________________________________
E. What types of delivery systems were you trained to use?____________________________
F. Did you receive release time for this training? ( ) Yes ( ) No
G. Would you be interested in participating in further faculty development training programs that focus on distance education training? ( )Yes ( ) No. Why? Why not?

17. If you did not receive distance training, would you be interested in participating in faculty development training programs that focus on distance education training? ( )Yes ( ) No. Why? Why not?

18. Place a check mark in the box that best describes your current status:

You **did receive training** and are seeking additional training ( ),
You **have never received distance training** and are seeking training for the first time ( )

Place a check mark in the boxes in the right hand column that correspond to the type of delivery system in which you would like to receive training.

Delivery systems used in distance education	**Delivery system in which you would like to receive training.**
A.Two-way audio-visual interactive conferencing	
B. Two-way audio, one way video conferencing	
C. Cable TV	
D. Two-way on-line computer conferencing (i.e., one to one yahoo messenger or chat rooms)	
E. CD ROM	
F. Video Tape	
G. Internet	
H. Email	
I. Other:	

IV. Support

19. If you are currently teaching distance courses, please place a check mark in the box that best describes the quality of support you are receiving.

Kind of support	**Very Good**	**Good**	**Fair**	**Inadequate**
A. Technical support				
B. Administrative Support				
C. Technical Distance Training Provided				
D. Pedagogical Distance Education Training provided				

V. Distance Education Delivery Systems

Synchronous learning is a context where the faculty member and the student are teaching and learning in a live setting without any delay in dialogue. Non-synchronous learning is a learning environment where there is a timed delay between faculty and student dialogue.

20. **Whether or not you are currently teaching distance courses, would you prefer** to engage in synchronous or non-synchronous learning environments? Please explain your answer and how these environments have influenced or would influence your decision to participate in distance education.

21. **If you are currently participating in distance education,** please place an "X" in the parenthesis that applies to the type of approach you would like to use in delivering your courses.
( ) I participate in a "systems approach" delivery of distance education (defined as a collaborative effort with other faculty, and course designers).
( ) I use a combined approach of consulting with faculty and course designers, and working on my own to deliver my distance courses.
( ) I am solely responsible for the design and delivery of my own distance education courses.

Please explain why you are participating as an individual or via a systems approach to distance education.

22. **If you are not currently participating in distance education**, but would consider participating in distance education, place an "X" in the parenthesis next to the approach that you would like to use in order to deliver your courses.

( ) I would prefer to participate in a "systems approach" delivery of distance education (defined as a collaborative effort with other faculty, and course designers).
( ) I prefer a combined approach of consulting with faculty and course designers, and working on my own to deliver courses.
( ) I would prefer to be solely responsible for the design and delivery of my own distance education courses.

Please explain the rationale for having selected your particular approach to course delivery.

VI. Rewards

23. Should your community college reward faculty differently for involvement in distance education than for traditional teaching and research? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes, why and how should they be rewarded? If no, why shouldn't they be rewarded differently?

24. Place a check in the box or boxes that correspond to the questions in the first column on the left.

How do you think faculty should be compensated	**Method of compensation**	**Place check mark here**	**Method of compensation**	**Place check mark here.**	**Method of compensation**	**Place check mark here**
For participating in distance education training	Release time		Stipend		Neither stipend or release time.	
For developing a distance courses	Release time		Stipend		Neither stipend or release time.	

VII. Relationship between the Mission of the Community College and Distance Education

25. Please check the category(ies) in which you believe distance education would most appropriately fit the mission distance education serves at your community college: ( )Teaching ( )Research ( )Service ( ) None of the three areas mentioned

26. To what degree do you think your community college is willing to commit its mission and budgetary resources in order to make the distance education program more successful (successful is defined as increased enrollments, increased retention of distance students, increased faculty participation, increased faculty support and rewards for participation in distance education and increased retention of distance education faculty)?

VIII. Motivating Factors

27. Please check the category that applies to your current status:

( ) Faculty who **are currently participating** in distance education,
( ) Faculty who **have previously participated** in distance education
( ) Faculty who **have never participated** in distance education.

Please rate the extent to which you agree that the factors listed below have **motivated, currently motivate or would motivate** you to participate in distance education. Circle the number (1 – strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree) that corresponds to your response.

Factors that might motivate faculty to participate in distance education.	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
1. Personal motivation to use technology	5	4	3	2	1
2. Reduced Teaching Load	5	4	3	2	1
3. Support & encouragement from division or dept. chair	5	4	3	2	1
4. More flexible working conditions (e.g., hours, location)	5	4	3	2	1
5. Increase in salary	5	4	3	2	1
6. Strengthened job security	5	4	3	2	1
7. Monetary support for participation (e.g., overload, stipend)	5	4	3	2	1
8. Expectation by the University that faculty participate	5	4	3	2	1
9. Opportunity to develop new ideas for courses	5	4	3	2	1
10. Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations	5	4	3	2	1
11. Receipt of grants for materials and expenses	5	4	3	2	1
12. Support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
13. Intellectual challenge	5	4	3	2	1
14. Technical, administrative and clerical support provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
15. Career exploration and expansion	5	4	3	2	1
16. Credit toward promotion and tenure	5	4	3	2	1
17. Release time	5	4	3	2	1
18. Distance education training provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
19. Merit pay	5	4	3	2	1
20. Royalties on copyrighted materials	5	4	3	2	1
21. Protection of intellectual property rights	5	4	3	2	1
22. Opportunity to diversify program offerings	5	4	3	2	1
23. Recognition and rewards from the college	5	4	3	2	1
24. Ability to reach new audiences that cannot attend classes on campus.	5	4	3	2	1
25. Opportunity to improve their teaching	5	4	3	2	1

Factors that might motivate faculty to participate in distance education	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
26. Change in faculty role from being a knowledge provider/ teacher centered to facilitating student learning	5	4	3	2	1
27. The opportunity to work with professional course designers, instructors and technologists to produce a course.	5	4	3	2	1
28. Creating support systems to retain distance education faculty	5	4	3	2	1
29. The opportunity to teach within a "synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1
30. The opportunity to teach within an "a-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1

IX. Inhibiting Factors

28. Please check the category that applies to your current status:
( ) Faculty who **are currently participating** in distance education
( ) Faculty who **have previously participated** in distance education
( ) Faculty who **have never participated** in distance education

Please rate the extent to which you agree that the factors listed below have: caused you question whether or not you want to continue participating in distance education, **caused you to cease your participation** in distance education, or **caused you not to participate** in distance education at all. Circle the number (5- strongly agree to 1 strongly disagree) that corresponds best with your response.

Factors that may inhibit faculty participation in distance education.	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
1. Concern about faculty workload	5	4	3	2	1
2. Lack of distance education training provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
3. Lack of support and encouragement from departmental colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
4. Lack of release time	5	4	3	2	1
5. Lack of professional prestige	5	4	3	2	1
6. Lack of your technological background	5	4	3	2	1
7. Lack of support and encouragement from dean or chair	5	4	3	2	1
8. Lack of grants for materials/expenses	5	4	3	2	1
9. Concern about quality of courses	5	4	3	2	1
10. Lack of technical, administrative and clerical support provided by the institution	5	4	3	2	1
11. Lack of merit pay	5	4	3	2	1
12. Lack of royalties on copyrighted materials	5	4	3	2	1
13.Lack of monetary support for participation (e.g., stipend, overload)	5	4	3	2	1

Factors that may inhibit faculty participation in distance education.	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
14. Concern about quality of students	5	4	3	2	1
15. Lack of recognition and rewards	5	4	3	2	1
16. Lack of salary increase	5	4	3	2	1
17. Lack of credit toward tenure and promotion	5	4	3	2	1
18. Loss of control over the teaching and learning process	5	4	3	2	1
19. Dislike for the collaborative nature of program delivery & design	5	4	3	2	1
20. The change in faculty role from providing knowledge to facilitating learning.	5	4	3	2	1
21. Having to teach in a "synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1
22. Having to teach in an "a-synchronous learning context"	5	4	3	2	1

X. Closing Questions:

29. What is your attitude toward distance education in postsecondary instruction?
( )Positive ( )Negative ( )Neutral

30. How would your decision of whether or not to participate in distance education be effected if there were different rewards available for becoming involved in distance education?

31. How does the absence of a research role at the community college affect your ability to participate in distance education?

32. How could your community college induce faculty to participate in distance education and retain them as distance faculty in the future?

33. *A facilitator enables students to interact with course content, learn from classmates and become active participants in their own learning. How do you think this paradigm shift from being a teacher who gives expert knowledge to a facilitator has impacted your decision of whether or not to teach in a distance education environment?

34. Is there anything else you would like to say about distance education?

---

*Moore, M. & Kearsley, G. (1996). Distance education: a systems view.. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Dear Community College Faculty Member,

I am Lisa O'Quinn, an administrative faculty member who works at the ______ Campus. Currently, I am conducting a survey of teaching faculty and division chairs and I need to ask for your help. This survey is for my dissertation, entitled "What factors motivate and deter community college faculty's participation in distance education."

Having worked at this community college and a community college in Upstate New York , I have seen how faculty like you can provide opportunities for life long learning to students who otherwise would not have access to a college education. This survey provides you with the opportunity to express your views and opinions on distance education; primarily the factors that motivate and deter you from participating, how the change of the faculty role has impacted your participation and the presence or lack of rewards or support has had upon your decision of whether or not to participate in distance education. The intent of this survey is not to support or oppose distance education, but rather to identify factors that affect faculty's willingness to participate or not to participate in distance education.

This survey has been designed to include faculty who do not participate in distance education, those who participate and have previously participated in both classroom and distance education and those who participate only in distance education. Only full-time faculty have been randomly selected to receive this survey.

I know you are very busy with your classes, but, I would greatly appreciate it if you could take a few minutes to complete the survey and return it to me via campus mail. Please use the address label I have attached and place it on the campus envelope. Your survey serves as my primary source of data for this dissertation. I assure you that any thoughts you share on this survey will remain in **complete confidence**.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by phone at _______ or by email at ____________. If you are interested in receiving a summary of results please let me know by phone or email. Thank you for your time and support.

Sincerely,

Lisa R. O'Quinn

Dear Professor ,

I am Lisa O'Quinn and I recently sent you a survey about distance education and faculty rewards. If you have already responded to this survey please disregard this email. If you have not responded I would appreciate it if you could please complete it and send it to me via campus email.

Sincerely,

Lisa O'Quinn

Lisa R. O'Quinn

Interview Questions for the Dean and Associate Dean of Distance Learning

Immediate Concerns:

What is your greatest concern now in terms of:

- Faculty participation
- Fiscal resources
- Maintaining technological growth

What percentage of the budget for the five campuses does ELI represent?

What college program or objective competes most with ELI for institutional resources?

How willing would the College be to commit resources to ELI at the expense of other programs that have an equal potential for growth?

Future Plans:

How do you see ELI expanding in the future?

How do you see this competition as enhancing or stifling ELI's growth?

Faculty Participation:

What mechanisms do you have in place to attract and retain distance education faculty?

At what level do faculty participate in distance education, i.e., do they teach, co-teach and/or design distance education courses?

Do you foresee a change in the rate of faculty participation in distance education as older faculty retire and the college hires younger faculty?

What characteristics do most faculty possess who want to learn how to teach distance education (characteristics are defined in terms of age, number of years teaching, academic discipline, openness to learning new technology, etc.)?

Inhibitors/Motivators:

Based upon your experience of working with faculty what motivates them to engage in distance education? What inhibits them?

Change in Faculty Role:

A facilitator enables students to interact with course content, learn from classmates and become active participants in their own learning. How do you think this paradigm shift from being a teacher who gives expert knowledge to a facilitator has impacted faculty's decision of whether or not to teach in a distance education environment?

Course Delivery and Design:

Present Course Delivery and Design:

How does the College presently design and deliver its distance courses? Is there a team of course designers and technologists who assist faculty in this process, or are faculty solely responsible for the design and the delivery of their own courses?

Future Course Delivery and Design:

How do you see the process by which courses are delivered and designed changing in the future?

Training:

Present Training Opportunities:

What opportunities do faculty have for training across the five campuses?

What percentage of all full-time NOVA faculty have chosen to participate in distance education training?

Do you know of the total number of faculty who have received training, how many actually teach via distance education?

What training courses seem to be the most popular?

Do you have more synchronous or non-synchronous courses? Which do you believe faculty prefer the most?

Future Training Opportunities:

What distance education training courses do you plan to offer in the future?

Institutional Support:

What types of support are currently available to distance education faculty, in terms of technical and pedagogical terms?

Are there any formal faculty mentor programs that enable new distance education faculty to benefit from the knowledge gained by experienced distance faculty and allow for a dialogue between the two groups of faculty? If not are there any plans to formalize these relationships?

Student Enrollment:

Are there more students enrolled in ELI in the Northern Virginia area or down state?

What percentage of the student population does ELI serve?

Some faculty at other community colleges have commented that funding for distance education should be proportionate to the percentage of the student population that it serves. For example some faculty think that distance learning supports a small but albeit important part of the student population (i.e., the adult learner who works full-time and attends school part-time, and has limited access to campus), but is not appropriate for the majority of the community college population (i.e., the traditional aged student 18-21, who attends college full-time). How would you respond to these faculty?

Rewards:

Do you think the college should reward distance education faculty differently from their colleagues who teach only in a traditional classroom setting?

Do you think faculty participation in distance education would increase if they were rewarded differently?

Do you think that faculty should be rewarded for engaging in training and each time they develop a distance course or just for one of these activities?

Which category(ies) do you believe distance education would most appropriately fit the mission distance education serves at your community college: teaching, research, service or none of the three areas mentioned.

Predictions:

In the 1999 League for Innovation in the Community College publication "Faculty Guide for Moving Teaching and Learning to the Web" higher education is divided into six components and predicts change will occur in each one as a result of the growth of technology and distance learning. I would like to focus on growth of the following components:

Degree and continuing education programs

The League for innovation predicts that community college will offer an increasing number of credit and non-credit degrees and certificates and interaction with faculty will be an important facet of these programs. However, access to faculty will be costly in terms of money and time (League for Innovation, 1999).

Institutional Infrastructure

Learning will take place independent from time and place and the community college's ability to deliver these learning opportunities will be dependent upon the quality of tools, systems and qualified personnel. (League for Innovation, 1999).

Faculty and student tools and roles

Faculty work and roles will become dramatically different and specialized. In the classroom design and delivery of courses the faculty member is responsible for every stage of course development. Presently, faculty are expected to embrace the role of content, be conversant with the software and media that enable them to deliver their courses and teach students new ways to learn – i.e., how to be more self directed learners. Thus, with the growing number of responsibilities faculty cannot be expected to be design and deliver courses entirely by themselves – they must learn how to collaborate with their colleagues. Thus in the future, students' learning will become more collaborative and independent and faculty's teaching will become more collaborative (League for Innovation, 1999).

How do you see each the growth and exchange anticipated in each one of these components as impacting faculty's participation in distance education?

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Reproduction Release

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Factors that Influence Community College Faculty Participation in Distance Education

Author(s): Lisa R. O'Quinn, Ed.D.

Corporate Source:

Publication Date: May 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
↑ ☒	↑ ☐	↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other *service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Lisa R. O'Quinn, Assistant Professor	
Organization/Address: Northern Virginia Community College 8333 Little River Turnpike Annandale, VA 22003	Telephone: 703-323-3164	Fax: 703-323-3015
	E-mail Address: loquinn@gwu.edu	Date: 2/25/03

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706
Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742